

MAN AND HIS BECOMING

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

East and West Journal, 1982] (New Edition in preparation.)

The Crisis of the Modern World (Lancaster, 1961)

Introduction to the Study of the Hindu Deities (Lanc. 1949)

de Talsophanes : auteurs d'une grande réflexion



2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638 2639 2640 2641 2642 2643 2644 2645 2646 2647 2648 2649 2650 2651 2652 2653 2654 2655 2656 2657 2658 2659 2660 2661 2662 2663 2664 2665 2666 2667 2668 2669 2670 2671 2672 2673 2674 2675 2676 2677 2678 2679 2680 2681 2682 2683 2684 2685 2686 2687 2688 2689 2690 2691 2692 2693 2694 2695 2696 2697 2698 2699 2700 2701 2702 2703 2704 2705 2706 2707 2708 2709 2710 2711 2712 2713 2714 2715 2716 2717 2718 2719 2720 2721 2722 2723 2724 2725 2726 2727 2728 2729 2730 2731 2732 2733 2734 2735 2736 2737 2738 2739 2740 2741 2742 2743 2744 2745 2746 2747 2748 2749 2750 2751 2752 2753 2754 2755 2756 2757 2758 2759 2760 2761 2762 2763 2764 2765 2766 2767 2768 2769 2770 2771 2772 2773 2774 2775 2776 2777 2778 2779 2780 2781 2782 2783 2784 2785 2786 2787 2788 2789 2790 2791 2792 2793 2794 2795 2796 2797 2798 2799 2800 2801 2802 2803 2804 2805 2806 2807 2808 2809 2810 2811 2812 2813 2814 2815 2816 2817 2818

^a“Shedding” refers to the loss of the outer coat of the virus particle.

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

• **Can I find out what my child's teacher thinks about my child's behavior?**

Le Signer de la Qualité et les Signes des Meilleurs Produits sont...

En Principes de Calcul infinitésimal (Gauthier, 1904)

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 111–117

MAN AND HIS BECOMING

ACCORDING TO
THE VEDĀNTA

By
RENÉ GUÉNON

Translated by
RICHARD C. NICHOLSON



LUZAC & CO.

45 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

1943

Printed in Great Britain
at the NEWBURY PRESS, LONDON AND, HARLOW.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	3
I GENERAL REMARKS ON THE YOGINTA	11
II FUNDAMENTAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE 'SELF' AND THE 'EGO'	17
III THE VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING, SEAT OF BRAHMA	18
IV PURUSA AND PRANATI	24
V PURUSA UNFOLDING BY INDIVIDUAL MODIFICA- TIONS	31
VI THE DEGREE OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION	34
VII BASIS OF THE HIGHER INTELLIGENCE	64
VIII MANAS OF THE LOWER ORDER, THE TEN EXTERNAL FACULTIES OF PERCEPTION AND ACTION	64
IX THE ENVELOPES OF THE "SELF": THE FIVE WHYTS OR VIBRA FUNCTIONS	75
X THE ESSENTIAL UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF" IN ALL THE STATES OF THE BEING	80
XI THE DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF ĀTMĀ IN THE HUMAN BEING	87
XII THE WAKING STATE OR THE CONDITION OF VAGROBHĀVA	90
XIII THE DREAM STATE OR THE CONDITION OF TAPASĀ	96
XIV THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP OR THE CONDITION OF PRĀṢṬĀ	101
XV THE UNCONSCIOUS STATE OF ĀTMĀ	100
XVI THE SYMBOLICAL REPRESENTATION OF ĀTMĀ AND ITS LOCATION BY THE SACRED MONO- SYLLABLE OM	111
XVII THE PNEUMATIC EXPANSION OF THE HUMAN BEING	120

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
XVIII. THE ELABORATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACULTIES	128
XIX. DIFFERENCES IN THE POSTHUMOUS CONDITIONS ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE	134
XX. THE COSMIC ARTIST AND THE "SOLAR RAY"	141
XXI. THE "DIVINE JOURNEY" OF THE BEING ON THE PATH OF LIBERATION	148
XXII. FINAL DELIVERANCE	152
XXIII. VIDYAS-MUKTI AND JIVAN-MUKTI	178
XXIV. THE SPIRITUAL STATE OF THE YOGI THE SUPREME IDENTITY	198
INDEX	194

PREFACE.

On several occasions, in previous writings, we have expressed the intention of undertaking a series of studies that would aim, according to the needs of the case, either at presenting a direct exposition of various aspects of the Eastern metaphysical doctrines or at making such adaptations of them as might seem most intelligible and advantageous, while however always remaining strictly faithful to their spirit. The present work constitutes the first of these studies. For reasons which have already been explained elsewhere, we have taken the Hindu doctrines as our central authority, and more especially the teaching of the *Pañcāra*, which is the most purely metaphysical branch of these doctrines. It should however be clearly understood that there is nothing in this procedure to prevent us, at occasion arise, from pointing out analogies and making comparisons with other theories, regardless of their origin ; in particular we shall refer to the teachings of other orthodox branches of the Hindu doctrine in so far as they clarify or complete the teachings of the *Pañcāra* on various points. To anyone inclined to raise objections to the adoption of such a method we would reply that such criticism is all the less justifiable in that our intentions are in no wise those of a historian ; we wish to re-assert emphatically, at this point, that our purpose is not erudition but understanding, and that it is the truth of ideas which interests us exclusively. If therefore it has seemed desirable in the present instance to supply precise references, we have done so for reasons quite unconnected with the special pre-occupations of Orientalists ; we simply wished to show that we have repeated nothing and that the ideas expounded derive from a genuine traditional source ; at the same time, for the sake of those who are able to profit thereby, we have

PREFACE

furnished the means of referring to texts containing complementary information, for it goes without saying that we make no claim to put forward an absolutely complete exposition of the doctrine, even regarding a single point.

As for an exposition of the entire doctrine, such a thing would be a sheer impossibility; either it would involve an interminable labour, or it would require to be put in so synthetic a form as to be quite incomprehensible to Western readers. Moreover, in a work of that sort, it would be extremely difficult to avoid an appearance of systematisation which is incompatible with the most essential characteristics of the metaphysical doctrine; doubtless this would amount to no more than an appearance, but none the less it would inevitably be productive of extremely serious errors, all the more so since Western people, by reason of their mental habits, are only too prone to discover "systems" even where none exist. One must for ever be on one's guard against affording the slightest pretext for unjustifiable ascription of this kind; better abstain altogether from expounding a doctrine than contribute towards generating it, even if merely through clumsiness. Fortunately, however, there is a way out of the difficulty; this consists in treating a particular point or one more or less definite aspect of the doctrine at a time, leaving oneself free to take up other points afterwards, in order to make them in their turn the subject of other separate studies. Moreover there will never be any danger of these studies becoming what the erudite and the specialists call "monographs," because the fundamental principles will never be lost sight of, and the secondary points themselves can therefore only appear as direct or indirect applications of those principles, from which all else derives, in the metaphysical order, that is to say in the realm of the Universal, there can be no place at all for "specialisation."

From the foregoing remarks it should be clear why we have restricted the scope of the present study to the nature and constitution of the human being: to make our con-

PREFACE

things intelligible we shall naturally be obliged to touch upon other subjects which at first sight may appear to be beside the point, but it will always be in relation to this one subject that we shall introduce them. The principles themselves are possessed of a range vastly exceeding the entire field of the applicable applications, but it is none the less legitimate to expound them, whenever such a thing is possible, in relation to this or that particular application, and this is a procedure which in fact offers considerable advantages. Moreover, it is only in so far as any question, no matter what, is related to principles that it can be said to be treated metaphysically; it is this truth which must never be lost sight of, so long as it is intended to treat of genuine metaphysics and not of the pseudo-metaphysics of European philosophers.

If we have embarked first upon the exposition of questions relative to the human being, that is not because these questions enjoy any exceptional importance in themselves from the purely metaphysical point of view: that point of view being essentially detached from every contingency, the case of man can never appear to it as a privileged one. We have begun with the discussion of these questions simply because they have already been raised during the course of our previous writings and thus a complementary work such as the present one now seems called for. The order in which any subsequent studies may appear will depend similarly on circumstances and will largely be determined by considerations of expediency, we think it advisable to mention this at the outset lest anyone should be tempted to set some sort of hierarchical order in our works, either as regards the importance of the questions treated or as regards their interdependence one upon another: that would be to attribute to us an intention which we have never entertained, but we know only too well how easily such misunderstandings arise, and that is why we take steps to dispell them whenever it lies within our power to do so.

There is a further point which is of too great importance

PREFACE

is to be passed over without comment in these preliminary observations, although we thought we had explained ourselves sufficiently clearly on other occasions; but we have noticed that some people have failed to grasp our meaning and it is therefore advisable to emphasize it still further. Genuine knowledge, which alone concerns us, has little if anything at all to do with "profane" knowledge, the studies which go to make up the latter cannot be looked upon even as an indirect path of approach to "Sacred Science"; on the contrary, at times they even constitute an obstacle, by reason of the often irremediable mental deformation which is the commonest consequence of a certain kind of education. For the understanding of doctrines such as those we are expounding a study undertaken merely "from the outside" is of no avail; as we have already remarked, it is not a question of history or philology or literature; and we will add, at the risk of repeating ourselves to a degree which some may consider fatiguing, it is not a question of philosophy either. All these things, indeed, belong to that order of knowledge which we class as "profane" or "external," not from contempt, but because it is in fact nothing else; one is not called upon to consider whom one may happen to please or displease; one simply has to describe things as they are, giving to each thing the name and rank which normally belong to it. The fact that in the modern West "Sacred Science" has been odiously caricatured by more or less conscious impostors is not a reason for keeping silent about it, or for ignoring, if not actually repudiating it; on the contrary, we declare unhesitatingly not only that it exists, but also that it is our sole preoccupation. Anyone who cares to refer to what we have already said elsewhere about the extravagances of the occultists and theosophists will not fail to understand that we are alluding here to something of quite a different order and that the attitude of people of that kind also can never be regarded by us as anything but "profane"; moreover they only make their case worse by pretending to a Knowledge which is not theirs, and

PREFACE

this is one of the principal reasons why we find it necessary to expose the absurdity of these pretended doctrines whenever the occasion presents itself.

From the preceding remarks it should also be clear that the doctrines we propose to discuss refuse to lend themselves, owing to their very nature, to any attempt at "popularization"; it would be foolish to try "to bring within everybody's reach"—to use a common phrase of our time—conceptions which can only come within the grasp of an elect, and to attempt to do so would be the surest way of distorting them. We have explained elsewhere what we mean by the intellectual elect, and what part it will be called upon to play if it ever comes to be formed in the West; while at the same time we have shown how a genuine and profound study of the Eastern doctrine is indispensable in preparing for its formation. It is in view of this work, the results of which no doubt will only make themselves felt after a long interval, that we believe it necessary to expound certain ideas for the benefit of those who are capable of assimilating them, without however modifying or simplifying them after the fashion of the "popularizers," which would be in flat contradiction with our avowed intentions. Indeed, it is not for the doctrine to stoop and reduce itself to the level of the limited understanding of the many; it is for those who are capable of it to raise themselves to the understanding of the doctrine in its integral purity, and it is only in this way that a genuine intellectual elect can be formed. Among several persons who receive an identical teaching, each one understands and assimilates it more or less completely and profoundly according to the range of his own intellectual possibilities, and in this way selection, "without which there could be no genuine hierarchy, comes about quite naturally. These questions have already been dealt with previously, but it was necessary to recall them before embarking upon a strictly doctrinal exposition; and the more unfamiliar they are to Western minds to-day, the more imperative it is to emphasize them.

CHAPTER I

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VIDYĀNTA

THE *Pañāna*, contrary to an opinion widely held among orientalists, is neither a philosophy nor a religion, nor does it partake to a greater or lesser extent of the character of either. Deliberately to consider this doctrine under these aspects is one of the gravest of errors, calculated to result in failure to understand anything about it from the outset ; in fact one reveals oneself thereby as a complete stranger to the true character of Eastern thought, the modes of which are quite different from those of the West and do not permit of inclusion within the same categories. We have already explained in a previous work that religion, if one is not to extend the scope of this word beyond its just limits, is something wholly Western ; the same term cannot be applied to Eastern doctrines without stretching its meaning to such a degree that it becomes quite impossible to give it any definition, even of the vaguest kind. As for philosophy, it also represents an exclusively Western point of view, one, moreover, much more external than the religious point of view and therefore still further removed from that of the subject we are about to study. As we said above, it is an essentially "positive" kind of knowledge even when it is not purely literary, and we cannot help thinking, particularly when we consider what philosophy has become in modern times, that its absence from a civilization is hardly a matter for regret. In a recent book a certain orientalist has asserted that "philosophy is philosophy everywhere," a statement which opens the door to undesirable assimilations of every kind, including those against which

¹ A single exception can be made for the very special sense in which the word is used to designate the "Hinduistic philosophy" : but it goes without saying that it is not *this* meaning alone that has at present taken its place, a sense which is everywhere almost unknown to the moderns.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

he himself quite justly protested on other occasions. That philosophy is to be found everywhere is just what we are at present contesting; and we decline to accept as "universal thought" (to adopt a phrase of the same author) what is in reality but an extremely special mode of thought. Another historian of the Eastern doctrines, while in principle admitting the inadequacy and inexactitude of those Western terms which have been persistently imposed upon them, nevertheless declared that he could see no way of dispensing with such terms, and he made as free a use of them as any of his predecessors. This appears all the more surprising inasmuch as for our part we have never experienced the slightest need to resort to this philosophical terminology, which would well suffer from the disadvantage of being somewhat repellent and needlessly complicated, even if it were not wrongly applied, as is always the case under such circumstances. But we do not wish to embark at present upon the kind of discussions to which these questions might give rise; we were merely concerned with showing, by these examples, how difficult it is for some people to step outside the "classical" framework within which their Western education has confined their thought from the outset.

To return to the *Pādhas*, it must be regarded as reality as a purely metaphysical doctrine, opening up truly unlimited possibilities of conception, and, as such, it can in no wise be contained within the more or less narrow framework of any system whatsoever. In this respect and without looking any further, one can observe a profound and irreducible difference, a difference of principle, distinguishing it from anything that Europeans include under the name of philosophy. Indeed the avowed aim of all philosophical conceptions, especially among the moderns, who carry to extremes the individualistic tendency and the resultant quest for originality at any price, is precisely to establish systems that are complete and definite, or—in other words essentially relative and limited on all sides. Fundamentally

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

a system is nothing but a closed conception, the more or less narrow limits of which are naturally determined by the "mental horizon" of its author. But all systematization is absolutely impossible in pure metaphysics, where everything belonging to the individual order is truly non-existent, metaphysic being entirely detached from all relatives and contingencies, philosophical or otherwise. This is necessarily so, because metaphysic is essentially knowledge of the Universal, and such knowledge does not permit of being enclosed within any formula, however comprehensive.

The diverse metaphysical and cosmological conceptions of India are not, strictly speaking, different doctrines, but only developments of a single doctrine according to different points of view and in various, but by no means incompatible, directions. Besides, the Sanskrit word *darśana*, which is attached to each of these conceptions, properly signifies "view" or "point of view," for the verbal root *drś*, whence it is derived, has as its primary meaning that of "seeing": it cannot in any way denote, "system," and if orientalisks translate it thus, that is merely the result of Western habits of thought which lead them into false assimilations at every step. Seeing nothing but philosophy everywhere, it is only natural that they should also see systems wherever they go.

The single doctrine to which we have just alluded is represented essentially by the *Veda*, that is to say, the sacred and traditional Science in its integrity, for this precisely is the proper meaning of that term.¹ It furnishes the principle and the common basis of all the more or less secondary and derivative branches which go to make up those diverse conceptions in which certain people have seen so many rival and opposed systems. In reality, there

¹ The root *vid*, from which *Veda* and *vidya* are derived, bears the two-fold meaning of "seeing" (*videre* in Latin) and "knowing" (as in the Greek *εἶδος*). Sight is taken as a symbol of knowledge because it is by the light of truth alone that we can see the visible world; and that symbolism is carried even into the purely intellectual order, where knowledge is likened to "seeing things," as is implied by the use of words such as "intuition," for example.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

conceptions, in so far as they are in accord with their principles, obviously cannot contradict one another; on the contrary, they are bound mutually to complete and elucidate each other. Moreover, there is no need to read into this statement the suggestion of a more or less artificial and belated "syncretism," for the entire doctrine must be considered as being synthetically comprised within the *Pañc*, and thus from its origin. Tradition, in its integrity, forms a perfectly coherent whole, which however does not mean to say a systematic whole; and since all the points of view which it comprises can as well be considered simultaneously as in succession, there cannot be any real object in enquiring into the historical order in which they may actually have been developed and rendered explicit, even apart from the fact that the sameness of oral transmission, probably lasting over a period of indefinite duration, would render any proposed solution quite misleading. Though the exposition may be modified to a certain degree externally in order to adapt itself to the circumstances of this or that period, it is none the less true that the basis of tradition always remains exactly the same, and that these external modifications in no way reach or affect the essence of the doctrine.

The concordance of a conception with the fundamental principle of the tradition is the necessary and sufficient condition of its orthodoxy, which term must however on no account be taken in this instance merely according to its religious mode; it is necessary to stress this point in order to avoid any error in interpretation, because in the West there is generally no question of orthodoxy except as viewed from the purely religious standpoint. In everything that concerns metaphysic or that proceeds more or less directly from it, the heterodoxy of a conception is fundamentally not different from its falsity, resulting from its disagreement with the essential principles. Since these are contained in the *Pañc*, it follows that it is agreement with the *Pañc* that constitutes the criterion of orthodoxy. Heterodoxy is found, therefore,

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

at that point where contradiction with the *Pada* arises; whether voluntary or involuntary, it indicates a more or less far-reaching deviation or distortion of the doctrine, which moreover generally occurs only within somewhat restricted schools and can only affect special points, sometimes of very secondary importance, the more so since the power inherent in the tradition has the effect of limiting the scope and bearing of individual errors, of eliminating those which exceed certain bounds, and, in any case, of preventing them from becoming widespread and acquiring real authority. Even where a partially heterodox school has become to a certain extent representative of a *darśana*, such as the *Ācārya* school in the case of the *Pañcavākyas*, no star is cast on the legitimacy of that *darśana* in itself; for it to remain within the bounds of orthodoxy it is only necessary to reduce it again to its truly essential content. On this point we cannot do better than quote by way of general indication this passage from the *Sāṅkhya-Pravāchana-Sūtrāḥ* of Viśvānātha-Bhikṣu: "In the doctrine of Kaṇva (the *Pañcavākyas*) and in the *Sūtrāḥ* (of Kapila), the portion which is contrary to the *Pada* must be rejected by those who adhere strictly to the orthodox tradition; in the doctrine of Jaimini and that of Vyāsa (the two *Mīmāṃsā*), there is nothing which is not in accordance with the *Śrīptures* (considered as the basis of that tradition)."

The name *Mīmāṃsā*, derived from the verbal root *mān*, "to think," in its derivative form, denotes the reflective study of the "Sacred Science": it is the intellectual fruit of meditation on the *Pada*. The first *Mīmāṃsā* (*Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*) is attributed to Jaimini; but we must recall in this connection that the names which are thus attached to the formulation of the different *darśanas* cannot be related in any way to particular individuals: they are used symbolically to describe what are really "intellectual aggregations," composed of all those who have devoted themselves to one and the same study over the course of a period the duration of which is no less indeterminable than the date of its beginning. The first *Mīmāṃsā* is

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

also called "*Karma-Mīmāṃsā*" or practical *Mīmāṃsā*, because it is concerned with actions, and, more particularly, with the accomplishment of rites. The word *karma* indeed possesses a double meaning: in a general sense, it means action in all its forms; in a special and technical sense, it means ritual action, such as is prescribed by the *Pada*. This practical *Mīmāṃsā* has for its aim, as the commentator Śaṅkarācārya says, "to determine in an exact and precise manner the sense of the Scriptures," but chiefly in so far as they include precepts, and not in respect of pure knowledge or *jñāna*, which is often placed in opposition to *karma*, an opposition corresponding precisely to the distinction between the two *Mīmāṃsās*.

The second *Mīmāṃsā* (*Ucāra-Mīmāṃsā*) is attributed to Vyāsa, that is to say to the "collective entity" which arranged and finally codified the vedicśruti texts constituting the *Pada* śruti. This attribution is particularly significant, for it is easy to see that it is not a historical or legendary person with whom we are dealing in this instance, but a positive "intellectual function," amounting, one may say, to a permanent function, since Vyāsa is described as one of the seven *Caryapitṛ*, literally "beings endowed with longevity," whose existence is not confined to any particular epoch.¹ To describe the second *Mīmāṃsā* in relation to the first, one may regard it as belonging to the purely intellectual and contemplative order. We cannot say theoretical *Mīmāṃsā*, by way of symmetry with practical *Mīmāṃsā*, because that description would give rise to ambiguity. Although the word "theory" is indeed etymologically synonymous with contemplation, it is none the less true that in current speech it has come to convey a far more restricted meaning; in a doctrine which is complete from the metaphysical point of view, theory, understood in this ordinary sense,² is

¹ Something similar is to be found in other traditions: thus in Tibetan they speak of eight "Incarnations" (reincarnations) of the Buddha who is without birth, without mother, without death, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life (in Tibet, *kyabje*, the Tibetan name of the Buddha, is, *kyab* "and it would probably be easy to discover yet other possibilities of a similar kind

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDANTA

not self-sufficient, but is always accompanied or followed by a corresponding "realization," of which it is, in short, but the indispensable basis, and in view of which it is ordained, as the means in view of the end.

The second *Āstika* is further entitled *Brahma-Mīmāṃsā*, as being essentially and directly concerned with "Divine Knowledge" (*Brahma-Vidyā*). It is this which constitutes the *Prasthāna* strictly speaking, that is to say, according to the etymological significance of that term, the "end of the *Yajur*," based principally upon the teaching contained in the *Upanishads*. This expression "end of the *Yajur*" should be understood in the double sense of conclusion and of aim. On the one hand, the *Upanishads* in fact form the last portion of the Vedic texts, and, on the other hand, that which is taught therein, is so far at least as it can be taught, is the final and supreme aim of traditional knowledge in its entirety, detached from all the more or less particular and contingent applications derivable from it. In other words, with the *Prasthāna*, we find ourselves in the domain of pure metaphysics.

The *Upanishads*, forming an integral part of the *Yajur*, are one of the very foundations of the orthodox tradition, a fact which has not prevented certain orientalists, such as Max Müller, from professing to detect in them the germs of a Buddhism interpreted after the modern fashion, that is to say of heterodoxy; such a statement obviously amounts to a contradiction in terms, and it would assuredly be difficult to carry misunderstanding further. One cannot insist too strongly on the fact that it is the *Upanishads* which have represented the primordial and fundamental tradition and consequently constitute the *Prasthāna* in its essence; it follows from this that in a case of doubt as to the interpretation of the doctrine, it is always to the authority of the *Upanishads* that it is necessary to appeal in the last resort.

The principal teachings of the *Prasthāna*, as extracted expressly from the *Upanishads*, have been co-ordinated and synthetically formulated in a collection of aphorisms

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

known either as the *Brāhma-Sūtra* or the *Śāhikrīya-Mīmāṃsā*¹; the author of these aphorisms, who is called Bāṭarapam and Kṛishṇa-Dvaipāyana, is identified with Vyasa. It is important to note that the *Brāhma-Sūtra* belongs to the class of traditional writings called *Sūtras*, which, like the *Upanishads*, like all the other Vedic texts, form part of *Śāstra*, but the authority of *Sūtras* is derived from that of *Śāstra* on which it is based. *Sūtra* is not "revolutionary" in the religious and Western sense of the word, as most orientlists would have it, who, here again, confuse two very different points of view; it is the fruit of direct inspiration, so that it is in its own right that it holds its authority. "*Sūtra*," says Shankarāchārya, "is a means of direct perception (in the sphere of transcendent knowledge), since, in order to be an authority it is necessarily independent of all other authority; while *Sūtra* plays a part analogous to that of induction, in that it derives its authority from its authority, other than itself."² But to avoid any misunderstanding as to the force of the analogy thus indicated between transcendent and sensory knowledge, it is necessary to add that, like every true analogy, it must be applied inversely³; that, while induction rises above sensible perception and permits one to pass on to a higher level, it is on the contrary direct perception or inspiration alone which, in the transcendent order, attains to the Principle itself, to what is highest, after which nothing remains but to draw the consequences and to determine the manifold appearances. It may further be said that the distinction between *Sūtra* and *Sūtra* is, fundamentally,

¹ The term *Mīmāṃsā* has been interpreted by Bāṭarapam (in his commentary) [see Bāṭarapam on the *Pragya-Sūtra*, Sahitya, I, Page 1, -text 1] as belonging to the "Vedānta" (Vedānta) which is in a sense "that which is" (Vedānta) in all things.

² In Hindu logic, perception (inductive) and induction of inference (deductive) are the two "means of proof" (pramāṇa), that can be legitimate means employed in the realm of sensible knowledge.

³ In the Hindu logic tradition, the principle of analogy is expressed by the following, sometimes from the *Upanishads*: "That which is below is like that which is above, and that which is above is like that which is below." But as regards to the Vedānta, this formula and apply it, inversely it is necessary to take it in the sense of "Vedānta" which, made up of two superposed sensible points, opposite ones.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

equivalent to that between immediate intellectual intuition and reflective consciousness; if the first is described by a word bearing the primitive meaning of "hearing," this is precisely in order to indicate its sensitive character, and because sound holds, according to the Hindu cosmological doctrine, the primordial rank among sensible qualities. As for *śravaṇa*, its primitive meaning is "memory": in fact, memory, being but a reflex of perception, can be taken as denoting, by extension, everything which possesses the character of reflective or discursive, that is to say, of indirect knowledge. Moreover, if knowledge is symbolized by light, as is most often the case, pure intelligence and recollection, otherwise the intuitive faculty and the discursive faculty, can be respectively represented by the sun and the moon. This symbolism, which we cannot enlarge upon here, is capable of numerous applications.¹

The *Śrīmad-Bhāṣya*, the text of which is essentially sacred, have given rise to numerous commentaries, the most important of which are those by Śaṅkarācārya and Rāmānuja; they are, both of them, strictly orthodox, so that we must not exaggerate the importance of their apparent divergences, which are in reality more in the nature of differences of adaptation. It is true that each school is naturally enough inclined to think and to maintain that its own point of view is the most worthy of attention and ought, while not excluding other views, nevertheless to take precedence over them. But in order to settle the question in all impartiality one has but to examine these points of view as themselves and to ascertain how far the horizon extends which they embrace respectively; it is, moreover, self-evident that no school can claim to represent the doctrine in a good and exclusive manner. It is nevertheless quite certain that Śaṅkarācārya's point of view goes deeper and further than that of

¹ "Images of these applications are to be detected even in speech: the example is in fact without number that the same word may be used to denote, in various languages, the three successive words denoting at one and the same time the seeing, hearing, the "seeing faculty" or "hearing faculty" and the "seeing" or the "hearing" itself."

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

Rādhakṛṣṇa, one can, moreover, infer this from the fact that the first is of Śaivite tendency while the second is clearly Viśiṣṭaite. A curious argument has been raised by M. Thibout, who translated the two commentaries into English: he suggests that that of Rādhakṛṣṇa is more faithful to the teaching of the *Brahma-Sūtra* but at the same time recognises that that of Śhaṅkarācārya is more in conformity with the spirit of the *Upanishads*. In order to be able to entertain such an opinion it is obviously necessary to maintain that there exist doctrinal differences between the *Upanishads* and the *Brahma-Sūtra*; but even were this actually the case, it is the authority of the *Upanishads* which must prevail, as we have explained above, and Śhaṅkarācārya's superiority would thereby be established, although this was probably not the intention of M. Thibout, for whom the question of the intrinsic truth of the ideas concerned hardly seems to arise. As a matter of fact, the *Brahma-Sūtra*, being based directly and exclusively on the *Upanishads*, can in no way be divergent from them; only their brevity, rendering them a trifling obscure when they are isolated from any commentaries, might provide some excuse for those who maintain that they find in them something besides an authoritative and competent interpretation of the traditional doctrine. Thus the argument is really pointless, and all that we need retain is the observation that Śhaṅkarācārya has deduced and developed more completely the essential contents of the *Upanishads*: his authority can only be questioned by those who are ignorant of the true spirit of the orthodox Hindu tradition, and whose opinion is consequently valueless. In a general way, therefore, it is his commentary that we shall follow in preference to all others.

To complete these preliminary observations we must again make it clear, although we have already explained this elsewhere, that it is incorrect to apply the denomination of "Eclectic Brahminism" to the teachings of the *Upanishads*, as some persons have done. The tradition-

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

ability of this expression arises especially from the fact that the word "esotericism" is a comparative, and that its use necessarily implies the correlative existence of an "exotericism"; but such a division cannot be applied to the doctrine in question. Exotericism and esotericism, regarded not as two distinct and more or less opposed doctrines, which would be quite an erroneous view, but as the two aspects of one and the same doctrine, existed in certain schools of Greek antiquity; there is also a clear example of this relationship to be met with in the Islamic tradition, but the same does not apply in the case of the most purely Eastern doctrines. In their case one can only speak of a kind of "natural esotericism," such as inevitably pertains to every doctrine, especially in the metaphysical sphere, where it is important always to take into account the inexpressible, which is indeed what matters most of all, since words and symbols, all told, serve no purpose beyond acting as aids to conceiving it, by supplying "supports" for a task which must necessarily remain a strictly personal one. From this point of view, the distinction between exotericism and esotericism would amount to no more than the distinction between the "letter" and the "spirit"; and one could also apply it to the plurality of meanings of greater or lesser depth contained in the traditional texts or, if preferred, the sacred scriptures, of all races. On the other hand it goes without saying that the same teaching is not understood in an equal degree by all who receive it: among such persons there are therefore those who in a certain sense discern the esotericism, while others, whose intellectual horizon is narrower, are limited to the exotericism; but it is not in this way that people who talk about "Esoteric Buddhism" understand that expression. As a matter of fact, in Buddhism, the teaching is accessible in its entirety to all those who are intellectually "qualified" (*adibhāva*), that is, capable of deriving a real advantage from it; and if there are doctrines reserved for a chosen few, it is because it cannot be otherwise where instruction is apportioned with discretion.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

and in accordance with the real capacities of men. Although the traditional teaching is not esoteric in the strict sense of the word, it is indeed "initiatary," and it differs profoundly in all its methods from that "profane" education which the credulity of modern Westerners so strangely overrates: this we have already pointed out when speaking of "Sacred Science" and of the impossibility of "popularizing" it.

This last observation prompts us to a further remark. In the East the traditional doctrines always employ oral teaching as their normal method of transmission, even in cases where they have been formulated in written texts; there are profound reasons for this, because it is not merely words that have to be conveyed, but above all it is a genuine participation in the tradition which has to be secured. In these circumstances, it is meaningless to say, with Max Müller and other orientalists, that the word *Upasādh* denotes knowledge acquired "by sitting at the feet of a teacher"; this title, if such were the meaning, would then apply without distinction to all parts of the *Pada*; moreover, it is an interpretation which has never been suggested or admitted by any competent Hindu. In reality, the name of the *Upasādh* denotes that they are ordained to destroy ignorance by providing the means of approach to supreme Knowledge; and if it is solely a question of approaching, then that is because the supreme Knowledge is in its essence strictly incommunicable, so that none can attain to it save by himself alone.

Another expression which seems to us even more unhappy than "Esoteric Brahmanism" is "Brahmanic Theosophy," which has been used by M. Otfried Müller, and he indeed admits that he did not adopt it without hesitation, since it seems "to justify the claims of Western theosophists" to have derived their mission from India, claims which he perceives to be ill-founded. It is true that we must certainly avoid anything which might lend countenance to certain most undesirable confusions; but there are still graver and more decisive reasons against

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDANTA

admitting the proposed designation. Although the self-styled theosophists of whom M. Chaurane speaks are almost completely ignorant of the Hindu doctrine, and have derived nothing from them but a terminology which they use entirely at random, they have no connection with genuine Theosophy either, not even with that of the West; and this is why we insist on distinguishing carefully between "Theosophy" and "Theosophism." But leaving Theosophism out of account, it can well be said that no Hindu doctrine, or more generally still, no Oriental doctrine, has enough points in common with Theosophy to justify describing it by that name; this follows directly from the fact that the word denotes exclusively conceptions of mystical inspiration, therefore religious and even specifically Christian ones. Theosophy is something peculiarly Western; why seek to apply this name word to doctrines for which it was never intended, and to which it is not much better suited than are the labels of the philosophical systems of the West? Once again, it is not with religion that we are dealing here, and consequently there cannot be any question of Theosophy any more than of Theology; these two terms, moreover, begin by being almost synonymous, although, for purely historical reasons, they have come to assume widely differing significances.¹

It will perhaps be objected that we have ourselves just made use of the phrase "Divine Knowledge," which is equivalent, after all, to the original meaning of the words "Theosophy" and "Theology." This is true, but, in the first place, we cannot regard the last-named terms exclusively from an etymological standpoint, for they are among those with reference to which it has by now become quite impossible to ignore the changes of meaning which long usage has brought about. Moreover, we readily admit that this term "Divine Knowledge" is not itself

¹ A useful remark could be made with regard to the terms "eclectic" and "syncretist," which were originally synonymous; among the scholars of the last century both designations which these terms still bear came to signify separately.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDĀNTA

entirely adequate; but owing to the unsuitability of European languages for the purpose of expressing purely metaphysical ideas, there was no better expression available. Besides, we do not think that there are any serious objections to its use, since we have already been careful to warn the reader not to apply a religious shade of meaning to it, such as it must almost inevitably bear when related to Western conceptions. All the same, a certain ambiguity might still remain, for the Sanskrit term which can be least inaccurately rendered by "God" is not *Brahma*, but *Īśvara*. However, the adjective "divine," even in current speech, is used less strictly, more vaguely perhaps, and therefore lends itself better to such a transposition as we make here than the substantive whence it was derived. The point to note is that such terms as "Theology" and "Theosophy," even when regarded etymologically and apart from all intervention of the religious point of view, can only be translated into Sanskrit as *Īśvara-Pāṭh*; on the other hand, what we render approximately as "Divine Knowledge," when dealing with the *Pādara*, is *Brahma-Pāṭh*, for the purely metaphysical point of view essentially implies the consideration of *Brahma* or the Supreme Principle, of which *Īśvara*, or the "Divine Personality," is merely a determination, as Principle of, and in relation to, universal manifestation. The consideration of *Īśvara* therefore already implies a relative point of view; it is the highest of the relativities, the first of all determinations, but it is none the less true that it is "qualified" (*sajjñā*) and "conceived distinctively" (*avasthā*), whereas *Brahma* is "unqualified" (*nirjñā*), "beyond all distinctions" (*avasthā*) absolutely unconditioned, universal manifestation in its entirety being strictly all beside its Infinity. Metaphysically, manifestation can only be considered from the point of view of its dependence upon the Supreme Principle and in the quality of a mere "support" for raising oneself to transcendent Knowledge; or again, taking things in the inverse order, as an application of the

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE VEDANTA

principal Truth. In any case, nothing more should be looked for in everything appertaining thereto than a kind of "illustration" calculated to facilitate the understanding of the Unmanifested, the essential object of metaphysics, thus permitting, as we explained when interpreting the title of the *Opusculum*, of an approach being made to knowledge unqualified.¹

¹ For a fuller account of all these preliminary questions, which have had to be treated in rather summary fashion in the present Chapter, we must refer the reader to our *Introduction to the Study of the Hindu Religion* (English translation published by Lutter, Paris), where these must so long be the main subject of study and have been discussed in greater detail.

CHAPTER II

FUNDAMENTAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE "SELF" AND THE "EGO"

IN order thoroughly to understand the meaning of the *Padjasa* as it pertains to the human being, it is essential to define from the start, as clearly as possible, the fundamental distinction between the "Self," which is the very principle of the being, and the individual "ego." It is hardly necessary to explain that the use of the term "Self" does not imply on our part any indelicacy of view with certain schools who may have used this word, but who, under an Oriental terminology, generally misunderstood, have never set forth any but purely Western views, highly fantastic at that; we are alluding here not only to Theosophism, but also to certain pseudo-Oriental schools which have entirely distorted the *Padjasa* under the pretext of adapting it to the Western mentality. The science which may have been made of a word does not, in our opinion, provide adequate grounds for declining to employ it, except where it is possible to replace it by another word equally well suited to express the same meaning, which is not the case in this instance; besides, too great a strictness on this score would undoubtedly leave very few terms indeed at one's disposal, especially as there exist hardly any which at one time or another have not been misapplied by some philosopher. The only words which we intend to reject are those invented deliberately to express views which have nothing in common with what we are expounding; such, for example, are the designations of the different kinds of philosophical systems; such, also, are the terms which belong specifically to the

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

vocabulary of the occultists and other "neo-spiritualists"; as far terms which the latter have merely borrowed from earlier doctrines which they habitually and shamelessly plagiarize without understanding anything about them, we obviously need have no scruples about employing such words, while at the same time restoring the meaning which normally belongs to them.

In place of the terms "Self" and "ego," we may also use those of "Personality" and "individuality," with one reservation, however, for the "Self," as we shall explain later on, may denote something over and above the Personality. The Theosophists, who seem to have taken a delight in confusing their terminology, interpret the Personality and the individuality in a sense which is the exact opposite of that in which they should rightly be understood; it is the first which they identify with the "ego," and the second with the "Self." Previously, on the contrary, even in the West, whenever any distinction has been made between these two terms, the Personality has always been regarded as superior to the individuality and that is why we say that this is their normal relationship, which there is every reason to retain. Scholastic philosophy, in particular, has not overlooked this distinction, but it does not seem to have grasped its full metaphysical significance, nor to have extracted the most profound consequences which follow from it; this is moreover what often occurs, even on occasions when Scholasticism shows the most remarkable similarity with certain portions of the Oriental doctrines. In any case, the Personality, metaphysically speaking, has nothing in common with what modern philosophers so often call the "human person," which is, in fact, nothing but the individuality pure and simple; besides, it is the eternal and not the Personality which can strictly be called human. In a general way, it appears that Westerners, even when they attempt to carry their views farther than those of the majority, mistake for the Personality what is actually but the superior part of the individuality, or a simple extension

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

of it: in those circumstances everything which is of the purely metaphysical order necessarily remains outside their comprehension.

The "Self" is the transcendent and permanent principle of which the manifested being, the human being, for example, is only a transient and contingent modification, a modification which, moreover, can in no way affect the principle, as will be explained more fully in what follows. The "Self," as such, is never individualised and cannot become so, for since it must always be considered under the aspect of the eternity and immutability which are the necessary attributes of pure Being, it is obviously not susceptible of any particularisation, which would cause it to be "other than itself." Immutability is its own nature, it merely develops the indefinite possibilities which it contains within itself, by a relative passing from potency to act through an indefinite series of degrees. Its essential permanence is not thereby affected, precisely because this process is only relative, and because this development is, strictly speaking, not a development at all, except when looked at from the point of view of manifestation, outside of which there can be no question of succession, but only of perfect simultaneity, so that even what is virtual under one aspect, is found nevertheless to be realised in the "eternal present." As regards manifestation, it may be said that the "Self" develops its manifold possibilities, indefinite in their multitude, through a multiplicity of modalities of realisation, amounting, for the integral being, to so many different states, of which states are alone, limited by the special conditions of existence which define it, constitutes the portion or rather

¹ M. Remy Fouquet in review of the works of Aristotle and J. Maistre the famous tri-division of the human being between what he calls "self and self-image" (soul). But both of these, as he explains them, are far too vaguely included in the individuality and fall entirely within the scope of psychology, which, whatever he may have supposed, is quite incapable of extending as far as to include the Personality. However, the fact is that, when he has made such a distinction outside a field of presentation which deserves to be pointed out as metaphysical, is an author who had no pretensions to be called a metaphysician.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

the particular determination of that being which is called human individuality. The "Self" is thus the principle by which all the states of the being exist, each in its own domain; and this must be understood not only of the manifested states of which we have just been speaking, whether individual like the human state or supra-individual, but also,—although the word "exist" then becomes inappropriate,—of the unmanifested state, comprising all the possibilities which are not susceptible of any manifestation, as well as the possibilities of manifestation themselves in principal mode, but the "Self" derives its being from itself alone, and neither has nor can have, in the perfect and indivisible unity of its nature, any principle which is external to it.¹

The "Self," considered in this manner, as relation to a being, is properly speaking the Personality, one might say, it is true, restrict the use of this latter word to the "Self" as principle of the manifested states, just as the "Divine Personality," *Adonai*, is the Principle of universal manifestation; but one can also extend it analogically to the "Self" as principle of all the states of the being, manifested and unmanifested. The Personality is an immediate determination, primordial and non-particularized, of the principle which in Sanskrit is called *Ātma* or *Paramātmā*, and which, in default of a better term, we may call the "Universal Spirit," on the clear understanding, however, that in the use of the word "spirit" nothing is implied which might recall Western philosophical conceptions, and, in particular, that it is not turned into a correlative of "matter," as the modern mind is prone to do, being subject in this respect, even though unconsciously, to the influence of Cartesian dualism.² General metaphysics,

¹ It is our intention to set forth more systematically in other works the real physical theory of the being's multiple states. Here we need only recall its basic aspects of that theory that are indispensable to an understanding of the constitution of the human being.

² In theology, when it is declared that "God is pure spirit," it is reasonable to suppose that this statement must likewise not be taken in the sense of "spirit" as opposed to "matter," that is to say, according to the view in which these two terms have up to now been taken in reference to one another.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

Let it be repeated once more in this connection, lies quite outside all the oppositions of which that existing between "spiritualism" and "materialism" affords us the type, and it is in no way required to concern itself with the more or less special and often quite artificial questions which such oppositions give rise to.

Ātma permeates all things, which are, as it were, its accidental modifications, and according to Kāṇḍakya's expression, "constitute in some sort its body (this word being taken here in a purely analogical sense), be they moreover of an intelligent or non-intelligent nature," that is, according to Western conceptions, "spiritual" as well as "material," for that distinction, implying merely a diversity of conditions in manifestation, makes no sort of difference in respect of the unconditioned and unmanifested Principle. This, in fact, is the "Supreme Self" (the literal rendering of *Paramātmā*) of all that exists, under whatever mode, and it abides ever "the same" through the indefinite multiplicity of the degrees of Existence, understood in the universal sense, as well as beyond Existence, that is, in principal non-manifestation.

The "Self," in relation to any being whatsoever, is in reality identical with *Ātma*, since it is essentially beyond all distinction and all particularization; and that is why, in Sanskrit, the same word *Ātma*, in cases other than the nominative, replaces the reflexive pronoun "self." The "Self" is not therefore really distinct from *Ātma*, except when one considers it particularly and "distinctively" in relation to a being, or, more accurately, in relation to a certain definite state of that being, such as the human state, and in so far as one considers it from this special and limited point of view alone. In this case, moreover, the "Self" does not really become distinct from *Ātma*

is intended, and in this way would amount to accepting a kind of "dualism" (dualism, more or less akin to the *Māyā* attributed to the Monachism). It is only the *śūnyatā* (emptiness) that such an expression is of a *Ātma* that really leads itself to false interpretations, leading to the substitution of "a being" for pure Being.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

in any way, since as we said above, it cannot be "other than itself," and obviously cannot be affected by the point of view from which we regard it, any more than by any other contingency. What should be noted is that, to the extent that we make this distinction, we are departing from the direct consideration of the "Self" or "I" in order to consider its reflection in human individuality or in some other state of the being, for, needless to say, when confronted with the Self, all states of manifestation are strictly equivalent and can be regarded in the same way, but just now it is the human individuality which more particularly concerns us. The reflection in question determines what may be called the centre of this individuality, but if reduced from its principle, that is, from the "Self," it can only enjoy a purely illusory existence, for it is from that principle that it derives all its reality, and it effectually possesses this reality only through participation in the nature of the "Self," that is, in so far as it is identified therewith by universalisation.

The Personality, let us insist once more, belongs essentially to the order of principles in the strictest sense of the word, that is, to the universal order; it cannot therefore be considered from any point of view except that of pure metaphysics, which has precisely the Universal for its domain. The pseudo-metaphysicians of the West are in the habit of confusing with the Universal things which, in reality, pertain to the individual order; or rather, as they have no conception at all of the Universal, that to which they fallaciously apply this name is usually the general, which is properly speaking but a mere extension of the individual. Some carry the confusion still farther; the "empiricist" philosophers, who cannot even conceive the general, identify it with the collective, which by right belongs to the particular order only; and by means of these successive degradations they end by reducing all things to the level of sensory knowledge, which many indeed regard as the only kind of knowledge possible, because their mental horizon does not extend beyond this

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

domains and because they wish to impose on everybody the limitations which are but the effect of their own incapacity, whether inherent or acquired through a particular form of education.

To obviate all misunderstandings of the kind which we have just described and in order to avoid tedious repetition, we will here, once and for all, provide the following table, which sets forth the essential distinctions in this connection, and to which we ask our readers to refer whenever necessary.

Universal		
Individual	{ General	{ Collective
	{ Particular	
		{ Singular

It is important to add that the distinction between the Universal and the individual must not be regarded as a correlation, for the second of these two terms, being strictly annulled in respect of the first, cannot in any way be opposed to it. The same holds good with regard to the unmanifested and the manifested. Moreover, it might at first sight appear that the Universal and the unmanifested should coincide, and from a certain point of view their identification would in fact be justified, since, metaphysically, it is the unmanifested which is the all-essential. However, account must be taken of certain states of manifestation which, being formless, are from that very fact super-individual; if, therefore, we only distinguish between the Universal and the individual we shall be forced to assign these states to the Universal, which we are the better able to do inasmuch as it is a question of a manifestation which is still in a way principal, at least by comparison with individual states; but this, it should be clearly understood, must not lead us to forget that all that is manifested, even at this higher level, is necessarily conditioned, that is to say, relative. If we

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

reped things in this manner, the Universal will no longer consist solely of the unmanifested, but will also extend to the formless, comprising both the unmanifested and the supra-individual states of manifestation. As for the individual, it includes all degrees of formal manifestation, that is, all states in which beings are invested with form, for what properly characterizes individuality and essentially constitutes it as such is precisely the presence of form among the limiting conditions which define and determine a given state of existence. We can now sum up these further considerations in the following table :

Universal	{ The Unmanifested Formless Manifestation	
Individual	{ Formal Manifestation :	Subtle state Gross state

The terms "subtle state" and "gross state," which are assigned to the different degrees of formal manifestation, will be explained later; but we may point out now that this last distinction only holds good on condition that we take as our starting point the human individuality, or more precisely, the corporeal and sensible world. The "gross state" in fact is nothing else than corporeal existence itself, to which, as we shall see, human individuality belongs by one of its modalities only, and not in its integral development. As to the "subtle state," it includes, in the first place, the extra-corporeal modalities of the human being, or of every other being situated in the same state of existence, and also, in the second place, all other individual states. It is therefore evident that these two terms are not truly symmetrical and cannot even have any common measure, since one of them represents only a portion of one out of the indefinite multiplicity of states which constitute formal manifestation, while the other includes all the remainder of this mani-

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO INSTANCES.¹

Symmetry as a certain point is to be found on condition that we restrict ourselves to the consideration of the human individuality alone, and it is, moreover, from this point of view that the distinction is questionable in the first place established by the Hindu doctrine. Even if afterwards transcends this point of view, or even if it has only been entertained with the ulterior object of transcending it effectively, it remains nevertheless true that it must inevitably be taken as a basis and term of comparison, since it relates to the state in which we actually find ourselves at the present moment.

It may be said, therefore, that the human being, considered in its integrity, comprises a certain sum of possibilities which constitute its corporeal or gross modality, and in addition, a multitude of other possibilities, which, extending in different directions beyond the corporeal modality, constitute its subtle modalities; but all these possibilities together represent, none the less, one and the same degree of universal Existence. It follows from this that human individuality is at once much more and much less than Westerners generally suppose it to be : much more, because they recognize in it scarcely anything except the corporeal modality, which includes but the smallest fraction of its possibilities ; much less, however, because this individuality, far from really constituting the whole

¹ This asymmetry can be made more multiple by applying to it a well-established observation of ordinary logic, whence an illustration of clarity of any kind is conceived, all possible things are necessarily divided into two groups, namely on the one hand things entered with the square root on the other hand things devoid of it. But, while the first-named group is found to be thus positively defined and determined, the second, which is only characterized in a wholly negative manner, is in no way limited thereby and is in reality indefinite. Thus, there is further asymmetry for any assumed standard between the two groups, which do not really constitute a twofold division, since their distinctions both, viewed merely from the formal point of view of a certain quality taken as a starting point, the second group possesses no homogeneity and may include things, for all relating in substance with one another, which however does not put the domain of its variety under the original terms of reference. Now it is precisely in this manner that the manifested can be distinguished from the unmanifested ; so also, within the manifested, analogous distinctions can be made between the formal and the formal and formless, within the realm of form itself, between the corporeal and incorporeal.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

being, is but one state of that being among an indefinite multitude of other states. Moreover the part of all these states is still nothing at all in relation to the Personality, which alone is the true being, because it alone represents its permanent and unconditioned state, and because there is nothing else which can better-order as absolutely real. All the rest is, no doubt, real also, but only in a relative way, by reason of its dependence upon the Principle and in so far as it reflects it in some degree, as the image reflected in a mirror derives all its reality from the object it reflects and could enjoy no existence apart from it; but this lesser reality, which is only participative, is illusory in relation to the supreme Reality, as the image is also illusory in relation to the object; and if we should attempt to relate it from the Principle, this illusion would become a pure and simple non-entity. We thus observe that existence, that is to say, conditioned and manifested being, is at one real in one sense and illusory in another; and this is one of the essential points which Western writers, who have distorted the *Fadhwa* by their erroneous and highly prejudiced interpretations, have failed to grasp.

We must furthermore warn philosophers more especially that the Universal and the individual are by no means for us what they call "categories"; and we will recall to mind—for the more modern among them seem to have forgotten it somewhat—that "categories" in the Aristotelian sense of the word are nothing but the most personal of all genera, so that they still belong to the individual domain, of which, moreover, they denote the limit from a certain point of view. It would be more correct to compare with the Universal what the Scholastics term "transcendentals," which do precisely transcend all genera, including the "categories"; but although these "transcendentals" belong indeed to the universal order, it would still be a mistake to suppose that they constitute the whole of the Universal or even that they are the most

DISTINCTION BETWEEN SELF AND EGO

important consideration in pure metaphysics; they are co-extensive with Being, but they do not transcend Being, at which point, moreover, the doctrine in which they are thus considered stops short. Although "ontology" does indeed pertain to metaphysics, it is very far from constituting metaphysics in its entirety, for Being is not the Unmanifest in itself, but only the principle of manifestation; consequently, that which is beyond Being is, metaphysically, much more important than Being itself. In other words, it is *Brahma* and not *Jivatma* which must be recognized as the Supreme Principle. This is declared explicitly and above all by the *Brahma-Sūtra*, which opens with these words: "Now begins the study of *Brahma*," to which Śaṅkarācārya adds the following commentary: "This first sūtra, while enjoining the quest of *Brahma*, advises a reflective study of the texts of the *Upanishads* carried out with the aid of a dialectic which (taking them as its basis and principle) is never in disagreement with them, and which, like them (but only in the capacity of simple auxiliary means), envisages "Deliverance" as the goal."

CHAPTER III

THE VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING, SEAT OF BRAHMA.

THE "Self," as we have seen in the previous chapter, must not be regarded as distinct from *Ātma*, and, moreover, *Ātma* is identical with *Brahma* itself. This is what may be called the "Supreme Identity," according to an expression borrowed from Buddhist ecstasies, where the doctrine on this and on many other points is fundamentally the same as in the Hindu tradition, in spite of great differences of form. The realisation of this identity is brought about through *Yoga*, that is to say, through the intimate and mental union of the being with the Divine Principle, or, if it is preferred, with the Universal. The exact meaning of this word *Yoga* is in fact "union," neither more nor less,¹ despite the numerous interpretations, each more fanciful than the last, which orientalists and theosophists have suggested. It should be noted that this realisation ought not strictly speaking to be considered as an "achievement," or as "the production of a non-pre-existing result," according to Śaṅkarācārya's expression, for the union in question, even though not actually realized in the sense here intended, exists none the less potentially, or rather virtually: it is simply a matter of the individual (for it is only in respect of the individual that one can speak of realisation) becoming effectively conscious of what really is from all eternity.

That is why it is said that it is *Brahma* which dwells in the vital centre of the human being; this is true of every

¹ The root of this word is to be found, scarcely altered, in the Latin *unire*, "to bind or connect," and the English word "join" shows that this is a true almost identical with the Sanskrit.

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

human being, not only of one who is actually "united" or "delivered"—these two words indeed denoting the same thing viewed under two different aspects, the first in relation to the Principle, the second in relation to manifested or condensed existence. This vital centre is considered as corresponding analogically with the smaller ventricle (*qalb*) at the heart (*al-bulbul*); but it must not be confused with the heart in the ordinary sense of the word, that is to say with the physiological organ bearing that name, since it is in reality the centre not only of the corporeal individuality, but of the integral individuality, capable of indefinite extension in its own sphere (which occupies, moreover, but one degree of existence), and of which the corporeal modality constitutes only a portion, and indeed, as we have already stated, only a very limited portion. The heart is regarded as the centre of life, and in fact, from the physiological point of view, it is so by reason of its connection with the circulation of the blood, with which vitality itself is essentially linked in a very special way, as all traditions are unanimous in recognizing; but it is further considered as a centre on a higher plane and in a more symbolical sense, through its connection with the universal Intelligence (in the sense of the Arabic term *Al-ʿAla*) as related to the individual. It should be noted in this connection that the Greeks themselves, and Aristotle among others, assigned the same part to the heart, also making it the seat of intelligence, if not *eye* to express it, and not of feeling as the moderns commonly do; the brain, in actual fact, is only the instrument of the mental faculty, that is, of thought in its reflective and discursive modes; and thus, in accordance with a symbolism which we have previously mentioned, the heart corresponds to the sun and the brain to the moon. It goes without saying, moreover, that in describing the centre of the integral individuality as the heart, the greatest care should be taken not to regard what is merely an analogy as an identification; between the two there is strictly speaking a correspondence only, in which, it may be

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

added, there is nothing arbitrary, but which is perfectly valid, although our contemporaries no doubt may be led by their habits of thought to disregard the profound reasons for such a thing.

"In this seat of *Brahma* (*Brahma-pura*)," that is to say, is the vital centre of which we have just been speaking, "there is a small lotus, a place in which is a small cavity (*dhara*) occupied by Ether (*Ākāśa*); we must seek That which is in this place, and we shall know It."

That which, as fact, dwells at the centre of the individuality is not merely the ethereal element, the principle of the four other sensible elements, as might be supposed by those who confine themselves to its most external meaning, that relating to the corporeal world only. In the latter world this element does in fact play the part of a principle, but is a wholly relative one, inasmuch as the world is eminently relative, and it is precisely this acceptance which has to be analogically transcended. It is indeed only in the capacity of a "support" for this transposition that Ether is mentioned here; the conclusion of the text expressly denotes this, since *if nothing more* were really being referred to, there would obviously be nothing to seek. And it may further be added that the lotus and the cavity in question must also be regarded symbolically, for such a "localization" as is no wise to be conceived literally once the point of view of corporeal individuality has been transcended, the other modalities being no longer subject to the special conditions.

Not is what we are at present considering merely the "living soul" (*Jīvaśūci*), that is to say, the particularised manifestation of the "Self" in life (*jīva*) and consequently in the human individual, viewed here more especially under the vital aspect which is one of the conditions of existence specifically determining the human individual state, and which applies moreover to the sum-total of modalities comprised in that state. Metaphysically, in

† *Chandogya Upanishad* (Śrīyogaśāstra 1.11), *Chanda* 1, *Śūchi* 1

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

fact, this manifestation should not be regarded separately from its Principle, which is the "Self"; and although this appears as *form* in the sphere of individual existence, in illusory mode therefore, it is *form* in its supreme Reality. "This *Atom*, which dwells in the heart, is smaller than a grain of rice, smaller than a grain of barley, smaller than a grain of mustard, smaller than a grain of millet, smaller than the grain which is in the grain of millet; this *Atom*, which dwells in the heart, is also greater than the earth (the sphere of gross manifestation), greater than the atmosphere (the sphere of subtle manifestation), greater than the sky (the sphere of formless manifestation), greater than all the world together (that is, beyond all manifestation, being the unconditioned)."¹ This is so, is fact, because ontology is necessarily applied in an inverse sense, as we have already pointed out, and just as the image of an object is inverted relatively to that object, that which is first or greatest in the principal order, is, apparently or any rate, last and smallest in the order of manifestation.² To make a comparison with mathematics by way of clarification, it is thus that the geometrical point is quantitatively nil and does

¹ *Chandogya Upanishad* (Vedaviksha 111, Ahimsa 12, dvaya). In this context, my Chinese help recalling the correct passage: "The Kingdom of Heaven is like a grain of millet seed, which a man looks and worships in his field, which is called in the land of all seeds, but when it is grown, it is the spread of millet seeds, and beneath a tree, so that the birds of the air sit and take in the branches thereof." (2) *Shivada-pur, verse 32 and 33*. Though the point of view is certainly a different one, it is easy to understand how the conception of the "Kingdom of Heaven" can be transferred so happily to the meaning of the true world for the development of philosophy. And there is no single feature of the passage new to the "land of the air," appearing as this new, the higher stage of the being, which of us can regard a similar spiritual expansion in another way of its expansion. Two birds, presumably united companions, dwell in the same tree: the one satiated and fed at the tree, while the other looks up without seeing. (*Shivada Purana*) *Chandogya Upanishad* (111, Ahimsa 12, dvaya 1). "And he says: 'I have seen, indeed, the end of the tree, which is visible, when it is cut in the middle of the tree and the tree is cut— the end is the unconditioned end, which is pure knowledge.' And the other, presumably, says that, there is the same reality demonstrated in the fact of an 'atom' matter."

² The same idea is very clearly represented the "cupel" in the last shall be first and the first last" (4. *Mathura* 12, 13).

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

not occupy any space, though it is the principle by which space in its entirety is produced, since spirit is but the development of its own *intrinsic virtualities*.¹ Similarly, though arithmetical unity is the smallest of numbers if one regards it as situated in the midst of their multiplicity, yet in principle it is the greatest, since it virtually comprehends all and produces the whole series simply by the indefinite repetition of itself. The "Self" is only potentially in the individual so long as "Union" is not achieved, - and this is why it is comparable to a germ or a germ, - but the individual, and manifestation in its entirety, arise through it alone and have no reality except through participation in its existence; while it infinitely transcends all existence, being the sole Principle of all things.

When we say that the "Self" is potentially in the individual, and that "Union" exists only virtually before its realization, it goes without saying that this must be understood only from the point of view of the individual himself. In point of fact, the "Self" is not affected by any contingency, since it is essentially unconditional; it is immovable in its "permanent actuality," and therefore there cannot be anything potential about it. Moreover, it is important to distinguish very carefully between "potentiality" and "possibility." The first of these two words implies aptitude for a certain development; it presupposes a possible "actualization" and can only be applied therefore in respect of "becoming" or of manifestation; possibility, on the contrary, viewed in the

¹ Even from a more external point of view, that of ordinary elementary geometry, the following observation can be made. In continuous display upon the plane regarding the line, the line engenders the surface and the surface engenders the solid. But in the ordinary sense, a surface is the intersection of two solids, a line is the intersection of two surfaces, a point is the intersection of two lines.

² In reality, however, it is the individual who dwells in the "Self," and the being becomes effectively conscious of this when "Union" is realized; but this conscious union implies a turning from the knowledge that characterizes subjectivity at birth, and which, in a more general way, conditions all manifestation. When it is said of the "Self" that it is not a *subject* (i.e., manifesting in the individual), this means that one has taken up the viewpoint of manifestation, and this is yet another example of application in an *active* sense.

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

principal and unmanifest state, which excludes all "becoming," can in no way be regarded as potential. To the individual, however, all possibilities which transcend him appear as potential, so long as he regards himself in separative mode, deriving his own being seemingly from himself, whatever he means is strictly speaking but a reflection and not those possibilities themselves; and although this is only an illusion, we may say that for the individual they always remain potential, since it is not as an individual that he can attain them, for, once they are realised, no individuality really exists any longer, as we shall explain more fully when we come to speak of "Dedherence." Here, however, we need to place ourselves outside the individual point of view, although, even while declaring it illusory, we none the less recognise in it that degree of reality which belongs to it within its own order; even when we do come to consider the individual, it can only be in virtue of his essential dependence upon the Principle, sole basis of that reality, and as so far as, virtually and effectively, he is integrated with the whole being; metaphysically, all must ultimately be referred to the Principle, which is the "Self."

Thus, the dweller in the vital centre is, from the physical point of view, ether; from the psychic point of view, it is the "living soul," and thus far we have not transgressed the limits of individual possibilities; but also, and from the metaphysical point of view, above all, it is the principal and unconditioned "Self." It is therefore, in the truest sense, the "Universal Spirit" (*Atma*), which is in reality *Ishtam Iti*, the "Supreme Ruler"; and thus the description of this centre as *Ishtam-pura* is found to be fully justified. But *Ishtam*, considered in this manner as within man (and one might consider it in like manner in relation to every other state of the being) is called *Purusha*, because "It rests or dwells in the individuality (we are dealing, let us repeat once more, with the integral individuality, and not merely with individuality restricted

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

as (a corporal modality) as in a city (*para-typos*), for *para*, in its proper and literal sense, signifies "city."¹

In the vital centre, dwelling of *Parade*, "the sun shines not, nor the moon, nor the stars, still less the visible fire (the igneous sensible element, or *Tizon*, of which visibility is the peculiar quality). All things by the radiance of *Parade* (by reflecting its brightness); it is by its splendour that this whole (the integral individuality regarded as "macrocosm") is illuminated."² So, too, we read in the *Diaprosod-Gita*³, "One must seek the place (symbolising a vici) whence there is no return (no manifestation) and take refuge in the primordial *Parade* from whom hath issued the original impulse (of universal manifestation) . . . This place neither sun, nor moon, nor fire illumines, it is there I have my supreme abode."⁴ *Parade* is represented as light (*gyan*), because light is ri-

¹ This explanation of the word *Parade* should of course not be taken as if of an etymological derivation; it belongs to *Mantra* that is to say to the science of correspondence closely based on the scientific value of the elements out of which words are built up. This starting is generally not understood by scholars; it is however fairly clearly comprehended by the intellect drawn to the Indian traditions, and it was not until nearly unknown to the Occident, examples being found in the *Journal of India*. As for the meaning of *Parade*, it may be pointed out that *para* signifies the idea of "platitude."

² *Yajur-Samavedya Adhaya II, Vait 5, sloka 13*. Worded & parished Manjula II, Sloka 1, Shloka 2, Shloka 24, *Shankarabhasya-Spandan, Adhaya VI, Shloka 14*.

³ It is well known that the *Diaprosod-Gita* is an episode in the *Mahabharata* and in this connection it should also be remembered that the Indians, namely, the *Shivayans* and the *Madhwayans*, being included in the "varna," are therefore something quite different from those "eye persons" in the proper sense of the expression as understood by Occidentals.

⁴ *Diaprosod-Gita IX, 4 and 5*. In these last two are given an interesting account of the following passage from the description of the "Eternity, Jerusalem" in the *Apocalypse* II, 25, 26: "And the city that is built on the rock (symbol of the mass, to turn to it, for the glory of God and built on it) and the Lamb is the light thereof." From this it can be seen that the idea of the "Eternity" is not unrelated to the "city of Jerusalem," and for those who are aware of the relationship between the Lamb of Indian symbolism and the *Vedic Agni*, the comparison is still more justified. In order to parallel the idea of correspondence, it will be read, without any other signifying the last point, that we are to be wise trying to suggest that *Agni* and *Yajur* (the latter dependent of *Agni*) are integral and analogous, but not identical, such as the one that contains those two words who play an important part in symbolism, and moreover, in our work there is nothing between the two, since everything, including forms of *Diaprosod*, has a return for its expression. It is *para*—the setting, or the more correct, that the vehicle of *Agni* is a sun.

VITAL CENTRE OF THE HUMAN BEING

befores Knowledge : and it is the source of all other light, which is but its reflection, no relative knowledge being able to exist save by participation, however indirect or remote, in the essence of supreme Knowledge. In the light of this Knowledge all things are in perfect simultaneity, for, *par excellence*, there cannot be anything but an "eternal present," since immutability excludes all succession ; and it is only in the sphere of the manifested that the relations of possibilities which, in themselves, are eternally contained in the Principle, are transposed in terms of succession. " This Parasha, of the size of a thumb (*angula-matra*, an expression which must not be taken literally as denoting a spatial dimension, but which refers to the same idea as the comparison with a grain),¹ is of a clear luminosity like a smokeless fire (without any admixture of obscurity or ignorance) ; it is the Lord of the past and of the future (being eternal, therefore omnipresent, in such wise that it contains in its permanent actuality all that appears as past or future relatively to any given moment of manifestation, a relationship that is, moreover, capable of transference beyond that particular mode of succession which is time proper) ; it is to-day (is the actual state which constitutes the human individuality) and it will be to-morrow (and in all cycles or states of *repetit*), such as it is (in itself, principally, to all eternity)."²

¹ A comparison could also be made here with the "embryo" of the human body, as it is taught for the Taoist tradition.

² *Ishtak* (presented between 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22). In the Islamic texts, during the same *day* is defined as almost perpetual, being, by itself, the light in its light, or being (perpetual) eternally. " The *day* is as it is, such as the sun, from all eternity, every day in the state of 'eternal' creation." The only difference concerns the idea of duration, which is rather the domain of these traditional divisions (and also in some way of order) (as of in *Parasha*). Fundamentally it is nothing but a particular way of saying with the idea of universal manifestation and its relation with the Principle.

CHAPTER IV

PURUSA AND PRADAN

We must now consider *Purusa* no longer in itself, but in relation to manifestation; and this will enable us here on to understand better why it can be regarded under several aspects, while being at the same time one in reality. It may be said then that *Purusa*, in order that manifestation may be produced, must enter into correlation with another principle, although such a correlation is really non-existent in relation to the highest (absolute) aspect of *Purusa*, for there cannot in truth be any other principle than the Supreme Principle, except in a relative sense; but since we are dealing, even principally, with manifestation, we are already in the realm of relativity. The correlate of *Purusa* is thus *Pradán*, the undifferentiated primordial substance; it is the passive principle, which is represented as feminine, while *Purusa*, also called *Puruṣa*, is the active principle, represented as masculine; and these two are the poles of all manifestation, though remaining unmanifested themselves. It is the union of these complementary principles which produces the integral development of the human individual state, and that applies relatively to each individual. Moreover the same may be said of all other manifested states of the being and not only of the human state; for, although we have to consider this state more especially, it is important always to remember that it is but one state among others, and that it is not merely at the confines of human individuality but rather at the confines of the totality of manifested states, in their indefinite multiplicity, that *Purusa* and *Pradán* appear to us as proceeding in some sort from a polarisation of principal Being.

It, instead of considering each individual separately, we consider the whole of a domain formed by a determinate

PERUSA AND PRANITI

degrees of existence, such as the individual domain in which the human state unfolds itself (or no matter what other analogous domain of manifested existence similarly owing its definition to the combination of certain special and limiting conditions). *Perusa* is, for such a domain (prelating all the beings who develop their corresponding possibilities of manifestation in it, successively as well as simultaneously), identified with *Prapitan*, the "Lord of produced beings," an expression of *Bratwa* itself in so far as it is conceived as Divine Will and Supreme Ruler.¹ This Will is manifested in more particular form, for each special cycle of existence, as the *Mora* of that cycle, who gives it its Law (*Dharma*). *Mora*, indeed, as has already been explained elsewhere, must on no account be regarded as a personage or as a "myth," but rather as a principle, which is properly speaking the Cosmic Intelligence, reflected image of *Bratwa* (and in reality one with it), expressing itself as the primordial and universal Legislator.² Just as *Mora* is the prototype of man (*ahavira*), the pair *Perusa-Praniti*, relatively to a determinate state of being, may be considered as equivalent, in the realm of existence corresponding to that state, to what modern criterion calls "Universal Man" (*El-idealizador*).³ This conception, moreover, may be further extended to embrace the totality of manifested states and it then establishes the analogy between the conformation of the universal manifestation and that of its individual human quality.⁴

¹ *Prapitan* is also *Pitakakama*, the "universal constructive principle", his name and function are manifest capable of various applications, more or less significant according to whether or not they are related to the consideration of this or that cycle or determinate state.

² It is interesting to note that in other traditions the potential Legislator is also called by a name the root of which is the same as that of the Hindu *Mora* : we have for example *Mora* among the Egyptians and *Mora* among the Chinese : it is therefore a mistake to look upon these names as indicating identical personages.

³ This is the *Idem* Godness of the Hebrew *Idemela* : it is also the "Egg" of the first Platonic tradition (*Tach-Riv KRM*).

⁴ It is worth remembering that the structure of cosmic parts manifestly upon this analogy. Concerning the function of *Perusa* considered from the point of view we are discussing here, see especially the "Representations of the Big-Peak, A, 36" : *Pitakakama*, in regard to function of "Universal Man" : in regards to the "Great Archimed of the Cosmos" of the Western tradition.

us, to adopt the language used by certain Western schools, between the "macrocosm" and the "microcosm."²

Now it is essential to notice that the conception of the pair *Puruṣa-Prakṛti* has nothing at all to do with any "dualistic" conception whatsoever, and in particular that it is totally different from the "spirit-matter" dualism of modern Western philosophy, the origin of which is really imputable to Cartesianism. *Puruṣa* cannot be regarded as corresponding to the philosophical notion of "spirit," as we have already pointed out in connection with the description of *Ātma* as "Universal Spirit," which term is only acceptable on condition that it is taken in quite a different sense; and despite the assertions of a considerable number of orientalists, *Prakṛti* corresponds even less to the notion of "matter," which is in fact so completely foreign to Hindu thought that there is no word in Sanskrit with which to translate it, even approximately; this shows moreover that such a notion is lacking in any real foundation. Furthermore, it is very probable that even the Greeks themselves did not possess the notion of matter as understood by the modern philosophers as well as physicists; at any rate the meaning of the word *θεο*, in Aristotle, is exactly that of "substance" in all its universality, and *ουλη* (which is unsatisfactorily rendered by the word "form," on account of the ambiguity to which it too easily gives rise) corresponds no less precisely to "essence" regarded as the correlative of "substance." Indeed, these terms "Essence" and "Substance," taken in their widest sense, are perhaps those which give the most exact idea in Western languages of the conception we are discussing, a conception of a much more universal order than that of "spirit" and "matter," and of which the latter represents at most but one very particular aspect, a specification referring to one deter-

² These terms properly belong to two Hellenistic theories and are included among those which, in our system, may be justifiably employed in spite of the abuse they have been guilty of by the pseudo-scientists of the present day.

minute state of being. outside this state it entirely loses its validity and it is as no wise applicable to the whole of universal manifestation, as is the conception of "Essence" and "Substance." It should further be added that the distinction between "Essence" and "Substance," primordial as it is in comparison with all other distinctions, is none the less relative; it is the first of all dualities, that from which all others derive directly or indirectly, and it is with this distinction that multiplicity actually speaking begins; but one must not see in it the expression of an absolute irreducibility, which is in no wise to be found there: it is Universal Being which, relatively to the manifestation of which it is the Principle, polarises itself into "Essence" and "Substance," without its intrinsic unity being however in any way affected thereby. In this connection it may be pointed out that the *Yadva*, from the very fact that it is purely metaphysical, is essentially the "doctrine of non-duality" (*advaita-vada*)¹; if the *Sādhya* has appeared "dualistic" to those people who have failed to understand it, that is because on point of view stops short at the consideration of the first duality, a fact which does not prevent its admitting everything that transcends it as possible, which is the very opposite of what occurs in the case of the systematic conceptions beloved of philosophers.

We have still to define more precisely the nature of *Prakriti*, the first of the twenty-four principles (*gunas*) enumerated in the *Sādhya*; *Perusha*, however, had to be considered before *Prakriti*, since it is inadmissible to endow the plastic or substantial principle (substantial in the strictly etymological sense of the word, meaning the "universal substratum," that is to say, the support of

¹ In our Introduction to the Study of the *Yogya* Sects we have been instructed that the "doctrine of non-duality" must not be confused with "monism." The distance from the latter may indeed, it almost seems, be conceived empty of a philosopher and not of a metaphysical system. *Yadva* has the "non-dual" doctrine, any connection with "monism." It is in all the less possible to parallelise these two with the latter dualism, which need in a translatable sense, always implies a system "materialism" which is essentially also metaphysical.

PURUṢA AND PRAKRITI

all manifestation) with spontaneity : it is purely potential and passive, capable of every kind of determination, but never determining itself. *Prakṛiti* cannot therefore really be a cause by itself (we are speaking of "efficient cause"), apart from the action or rather the influence of the eternal principle, which is *Puruṣa*, and which is, so to speak, the "determinant" of manifestation : all manifested things are indeed produced by *Prakṛiti*, of which they are so many modifications or determinations, but, without the presence of *Puruṣa*, these productions would be deprived of all reality. The opinion according to which *Prakṛiti* is self-sufficient as the principle of manifestation could only be derived from an entirely erroneous view of the *Śākhya*, originating simply from the fact that, in this doctrine, what is called "production" is always viewed from the standpoint of "Substance," and perhaps also from the fact that *Puruṣa* is only mentioned there in the twenty-fifth *sūtra*, moreover quite independently of the others, which include *Prakṛiti* and all its modifications : such an opinion, furthermore, would be formally opposed to the teaching of the *Pāṇi*.

Mūla-Prakṛiti is "primordial Nature" (in Arabic *Al-Furak*), the root of all manifestation (since *mūla* signifies "root") : it is also described as *Pradhāna*, that is to say, "that which is laid down before all other things," comprising all determinations potentially : according to the *Purāṇa*, it is identified with *Māhā*, conceived as "mother of forms." It is undifferentiated (*avyakṛta*) and "undistinguishable," neither compounded of parts nor endowed with qualities, inferable from its effects only, since it is imperceptible in itself, and productive without being itself a production. "Root, it is without root, since it

* In order to exclude any possible misinterpretation it should be added that the name which we have just to "Substance," differs notably from Spinoza's use of the same term, for, as a result of a "partialistic" conception, he employs it in referring to Universal Being (even, at least as far as he is capable of expressing it), as really (concretely) being as beyond the distinction of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛiti*, which are related to it as its three essential principles.

indifferentiation ; every manifestation or modification of substance, however, represents a rupture of this equilibrium, and beings in their different states of manifestation participate in the three *gunas* in different degrees and, so to speak, in indefinitely varying proportions. These *gunas* are not, therefore, states but conditions of universal Existence, to which all manifested beings are subjected and which must be carefully distinguished from the special conditions which determine and define such and such a state or mode of manifestation. The three *gunas* are : *sattva*, conformity to the pure essence of Being (*Sat*), which is identified with intelligible light or Knowledge and is represented as an upward tendency ; *rajas*, the expansive impulse, in accordance with which the being develops itself in a given state, and, so to speak, at a determinate level of existence ; and lastly, *manas*, obscurity, assimilated with ignorance, and represented as a downward tendency. We will confine our remarks in this instance to the foregoing definitions, which we have already mentioned elsewhere; this is not the occasion to enlarge further on these considerations for they lie somewhat outside our present subject, nor to speak of the diverse applications to which they give rise, more especially in relation to the cosmological theory of the elements ; these developments will find a more appropriate place in other studies.

CHAPTER V

POLARITY CHARACTERISTIC OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATIONS

According to the *Shagvaid-Glā*, "there are in the world two *Parashas*, the one destructible and the other indestructible : the first is distributed among all beings ; the second is immutable. But there is another *Parasha*, the highest (*vāmana*), which is called *Parashatma*, and which, as Impeccable Lord, pervades and sustains the three worlds (the earth, the air and the heavens, representing the three fundamental degrees between which all the modes of manifestation are distributed). As I traversed the destructible and even the indestructible (being the Supreme Principle of the one and of the other), I am enrolled in the world and in the *Paśa* under the name of *Parashatma*."¹ Of the first two *Parashas*, the "destructible" is *Paśad*, whose separate existence is in fact transitory and contingent like that of the individuality itself ; and the "indestructible" is *Arud* considered as the Personality, permanent principle of the being through all its stages of manifestation² ; as for the third, it is *Parashatma*,³ as the text explicitly declares, of which the

¹ *Shagvaid-Glā* IV, in. in. 18.

² They say : "the two *Paśas* who dwell on the same tree" according to the text of the *Parashad* mentioned in an earlier note. Moreover, *Glā* is also referred to a tree in the *Śukla Upanishad* *Āranyaka* II, VIII 2, which is, but in this case the application of the symbol is no longer "decorative" but "substantive". The world is like an overhanging fig tree (*śakambhā* *śākā*) on the roots of which *paśas* sprout like the air, while the branches give downwards into the earth, and the leaves of the *Paśa* are its leaves ; whoever knows it, the man knows the *Paśa*. The root is above because it stands for the Principle, and the branches are below because they represent the depicting of manifestation : if the figure of the tree is thus very quickly done, it is because analogy, here as everywhere else, must be applied in an inverse sense. In both cases the root is depicted as the source of *śakambhā* or *paśad* ; as this tree or its effect, the *Paśa* (basis of the "world-tree" as its tree being confined to India : the oak along the Volga, the lime-tree among the Germans, the ash among the Scandinavians, all play exactly the same part).

PURUṢA UNAFFECTED BY MODIFICATIONS

Personality is a primordial determination, in accordance with the explanation we have previously given. True as it is to say that the Personality is really beyond the realm of multiplicity, we may nevertheless, in a certain sense, speak of a personality for each being (we refer, naturally, to the being as a whole, and not to one of its states viewed in isolation). That is why the *Sāhitya*, the part of view of which does not attain to *Paraśakti*, often describes *Puruṣa* as multiple; but it should be noticed that, even in this case, its name is always employed in the singular, so as to emphasize its essential unity. The *Sāhitya* has nothing in common, therefore, with any "monism" of the kind associated with the name of Leibniz, where, moreover, it is the "individual substance" which is regarded as a complete whole, forming a sort of closed system, a conception incompatible with any notion of a truly metaphysical order.

Puruṣa, considered as identical with the Personality, "is, so to speak, a portion (*anśa*) of the Supreme Ruler (who, however, is really without parts, being absolutely indivisible and "without duality"), as a spark is a portion of the fire (the nature of which is wholly present in every spark)."² It is not subject to the conditions which determine the individuality, and even in its relations therewith it remains unaffected by individual modifications (such as pleasure and pain, for example), which are purely contingent and accidental, and not essential to the being, since they all proceed from the plastic principle, *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti*, as from a single root. It is from this substance, containing all the possibilities of manifestation

² The word *anśa* indicates that there is question of a comparison (knowing or of a measure of speech intended to facilitate understanding but which is not to be taken literally. Happily a Tamil text regarding a similar idea [Name of every part, such as that which makes one body of several organs for one being of several stages] . . . has no many participations in The Universal Ruler. These participations neither destroy, nor yet increase Him, for they are constituted by Him, are detached from Him." (Lingayat, chapter 3).—French translation by Paul Wignier, page 177.

³ *Śrīmad-Bhagavad-gītā*, chapter II, verse 23. We would remind the reader that in our interpretation we are strictly following the commentary of Rāmānujācārya.

potentially, that modifications are produced in the manifested sphere, by the actual development of these potentials, or, to use the Aristotelian expression, by their passage from potency to act. "All modification (parashas)," says Yajñna-Brahma, "from the original production of the world (that is to say, of each cycle of existence) to its final dissolution, proceeds exclusively from Parashā and her derivatives," that is to say from the first twenty-four names of the *Śikhā*.

Parashā is, however, the essential principle of all things, since it is *Parashā* which determines the development of the possibilities of *Prakriti*: but it never enters itself into manifestation, so that all things, in so far as they are viewed distinctively, are different from it, and nothing which concerns them in their distinctive development (that is to say, in "becoming") can affect its immutability. "Thus the solar or lunar light (capable of manifold modifications) appears identical with that which gives birth to it (the luminous source, considered as immutable in itself), but nevertheless it is distinct therefrom (in its external manifestation; likewise modifications or manifested qualities are, as such, distinct from their essential principle, in that they can in no manner affect it). As the image of the sun reflected in water quivers and fluctuates in accordance with the undulations of the water, yet without affecting the other images reflected therein, much less the solar orb itself, so the modifications of one individual have no effect on other individuals unaffected and, much more so, the Supreme Ruler Himself,"¹ who is *Parashā*, and with whom the Personality is really identical in its essence, just as all sparks are identical with fire considered as indivisible in its innermost nature.

It is the "living soul" (*Jīvātma*) which is here compared to the image of the sun in water, as being the reflection (*Jihvā*) in the individual realm and relatively to each individual of the Light, principally one, of the "Universal

¹ *Prashna-Upanishad*, Adhyāya II. Shloka 2, verse 10 to 20.

PURUSHA UNAFFECTED BY MODIFICATIONS

Spirita" (*Amśa*); and the luminous ray which confers effluence upon this image, connecting it with its source, is, as we shall see later on, the higher intellect (*śāśvata*), belonging to the realm of formless manifestation.¹ As for the water, which reflects the solar light, it is habitually regarded as the symbol of the plastic principle (*Pravṛti*), the image of "universal passivity"; this symbol, moreover, bearing the same meaning, is common to all traditional doctrines.² Here, however, a limitation must be imposed on its general sense, since *śāśvata*, although formless and supra-individual, is none the less manifested, and consequently derived from *Prabhu*, of which it is the first production; the water, therefore, can only represent here the potential sum of formal possibilities, or is other words, the realm of manifestation in the individual mode, and thus it leaves outside itself those formless possibilities which, while corresponding with states of manifestation, must none the less be referred to the Universal.³

¹ I must be pointed out that the ray presupposes a medium of propagation (manifestation in non-individualised mode), and that the image depicts a phase of reflection (individualisation under the conditions of a certain state of existence).

² In this connection one has in particular refer to the opening passage of Genesis I, 9:—"And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." The passage contains a very clear indication of the two complementary principles we are discussing here, the Spirit corresponding to *Purusha* and the Waters to *Pravṛti*. From a different point of view the same relation symbolically connected with the preceding one, *śāśvata* being of the higher part due due to assimilated with *Atman*, the symbolic water, the vehicle of *śāśvata*, which sits on the forehead, the "Water-way" that is contained in the primordial Waters—and it must also be noted that *Atman* is at the same time the "breath" (*śvāsa*), which is the first meaning of *śāśvata* in *śāśvata*. Lastly, it was adopted the particular point of view of the manifestation of the temporal world, *śāśvata* in *śāśvata* I say, but for the fact that it would imply not long to depress it, it would be possible to show that a perfect correspondence exists between the *śāśvata* and the *śāśvata* in regard to the development of the visible elements. In any case, even the clarity, for example, we have already given, an unambiguous three independent meanings referring respectively to the three fundamental degrees of manifestation (*śāśvata*, *śāśvata* and *śāśvata*) which are denoted as the "three worlds" (*Trikāśvata*) by the Hindu tradition. These three worlds also figure in the shorter Upanishads under the names of *Śāśvata*, *Śāśvata* and *Śāśvata*—over them is *śāśvata*, which is the prototypal state of non-manifestation.

³ If the symbol of water is taken in its usual sense, then the sum of formal possibilities is described as the "lower waters," and that of the formless possibilities as the "upper waters." From the point of view of correspondence, the parking of the "lower waters" from the "upper waters" is also described

MURKHA UNAFFECTED BY MODIFICATIONS

in Lemn's I, 6 and 7. It is this worth noting that the word *Y'ma*, which means "water" in Hebrew, has the grammatical form of the dual, which allows of its carrying off, among other meanings, the idea of the "double class" of the formal and formal potentialities in the potential state. The potential waters, before their separation, are the identity of the potentialities of manifestation, as so far as the latter constitutes the potential aspect of Universal Being, which is properly speaking *Freiheit*. But there is also another and deeper meaning in the same symbolism, which appears when *Y'ma* is taken over beyond Being itself. The waters then represent Universal Potentiality, conceived in an absolutely pure aspect, that is to say as so far as it is identical in the same sense as *Y'ma* with the domain of manifestation and not distinct from it. This first meaning is the highest of all, as the degree and intensity below it, in the original relation of Being, we have *Freiheit*, with which we have already now reached the Principle of manifestation. After that, remaining identical, the three fundamental degrees of potentiality can be considered as we have done previously: we then have, in the first two cases, the "double class" heteromorphism, and finally, in the supposed *Y'ma*, water as a specific element (and in which capacity it is already included, especially, like all Being, that portion in pure manifestation, as the basis of the "lower waters," for the whole manifestation plays the part of intermediate principle relatively to the pure manifestation. Thus, the above explanations are somewhat lengthy, we believe they will have served a good purpose in making it appear, by means of the examples given, to designated how a planning of meanings and applications can be extracted from the traditional texts.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEGREE OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION.

We must now pass on to consider the different degrees of the manifestation of *Atmā*, regarded in the Personality, in so far as this manifestation constitutes human individuality; and it may indeed literally be said to constitute it, since this individuality would enjoy no existence at all if it were separated from its principle, that is to say, from the Personality. The expression just used calls, however, for one reservation; by the manifestation of *Atmā* must be understood manifestation referred to *Atmā* as its essential principle, but it must not be inferred from this that *Atmā* manifests itself in some way, since it never enters into manifestation, as we have previously stated, and that is why it is not in any way affected thereby. In other words, *Atmā* is "That by which all things are manifested, and which is not itself manifested by anything"¹; and it is this point which must never be lost sight of throughout all that follows. We will repeat once more that *Atmā* and *Paratmā* are one and the same principle, and that it is from *Pradhāt* and not from *Paratmā* that all manifestation is produced; but if the *Sādhya*, because its point of view is chiefly "cosmological" and not strictly speaking metaphysical, sees this manifestation as the development or "actualisation" of the potentialities of *Pradhāt*, the *Pradhāt* necessarily sees it quite differently, because it regards *Atmā*, which is outside any modification or "becoming," as the true principle to which everything must ultimately be referred. It might be said that, viewed in this manner, the *Sādhya* and the *Pradhāt* represent respectively the points of view of "Substance" and of "Event," and

¹ *Keis Gyanakal*, *Atmā's* I. stanza 3, in c. The whole passage will be given in a subsequent chapter.

DEGREES OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION

that the first can be called a "cosmological" point of view, because it is that of Nature and of "becoming"; but, on the other hand, metaphysic does not limit itself to "Essence" regarded as the correlative of "Substance," nor even to Being, in which these two terms are unified; it extends much further, since it attains to *Parabrahm* or *Parashakti*, which is the Supreme Brahma, and, therefore its point of view (assuming that such an expression is still applicable here) is truly universal.

Furthermore, when we speak of the different degrees of individual manifestation, it should be readily understood that they correspond with the degrees of universal manifestation, by reason of the basic analogy between the "macrocosm" and the "microcosm" to which we have already alluded. This will be still better understood if one remembers that all manifested beings alike are subject to the general conditions which limit the states of existence in which they are placed; if we cannot, when considering any given being, really isolate one state of that being from the whole composed of all the other states among which it is situated hierarchically at a given level, so more can we, from another point of view, isolate that state from all that belongs, not to the same being, but to the same degree of universal existence; and thus all appears linked together in various different ways, both within manifestation itself, and also in so far as the latter, forming a single whole in its indefinite multiplicity, is attached to its principle, that is, to Being, and through Being to the Supreme Principle. Multiplicity, once it is a possibility, exists according to its own mode, but this mode is illusory, in the sense we have already ascribed to that word (that of a lesser reality), because the very existence of this multiplicity is based upon unity, from which it is derived and within which it is principally contained. When viewing the whole of universal manifestation in this manner, we may say that in the very multiplicity of its degrees and of its modes "Existence is unique," according to a formula borrowed from Median argument; furthermore

DEGREES OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION

there is a fine distinction which it is important to note here as between "unity" and "onity": the first embraces multiplicity as such while the second in its principle (not its "case," in the sense in which this word is applied to *Proti-it-only*, but as containing within itself, "essentially" as well as "substantially," all the possibilities of manifestation). It can therefore correctly be said that Being is one, and that it is Unity itself—in the metaphysical sense, however, and not in the mathematical sense, for at this stage we have passed quite outside the domain of quantity. Between metaphysical Unity and mathematical unity there is analogy but not identity; and similarly, when we speak of the multiplicity of universal manifestation, it is again not with a quantitative multiplicity that we are concerned, for quantity is merely a special condition of certain manifested states. Finally, if Being is one, the Supreme Principle is "without duality," as we shall see in what follows: Unity is indeed the first of all determinations, but it is already a determination, and, as such, it cannot properly be applied to the Supreme Principle.

Having given these few indispensable explanations, let us return to the consideration of the degrees of manifestation. It is necessary, as we have seen, to draw a distinction first of all between formless and formal manifestation; but when we confine our attention to the individuality, it is always exclusively with the latter that we are concerned. The human state properly so called, like every other individual state, belongs wholly to formal manifestation, since it is precisely the presence of form among the conditions contributing to make up a particular mode of existence which characterizes that mode as individual. If, therefore, we have to consider a formless element, it will also necessarily be a supra-individual element, and, as regards its relationship with human individuality, it must never be considered as constitutive

¹ The same idea is expressed by the Sanskrit adage: *Ekam et ceteram* (unity and the rest).

DEGREES OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION

of it, nor for any reason at all as forming a part of it, but as relating the individuality to the Personality. The Personality, indeed, is unmanifested, even in so far as it is regarded more especially as the principle of the manifested state, just as Being, although it is properly the principle of universal manifestation, remains outside of and beyond that manifestation (and we may recall Aristotle's "motionless mover" at this point); on the other hand, formless manifestation is also, in a relative sense, principal in relation to formal manifestation, and thus it establishes a link between the latter and its higher unmanifested principle, which is, moreover, the common principle of these two orders of manifestation. Similarly, if we distinguish, in formal or individual manifestation, between the subtle and the gross state, the first is, more relatively still, principal in relation to the second, and consequently it is placed hierarchically between it and formless manifestation. We have therefore, through a series of principles becoming progressively more relative and determined, a chain at once logical and ontological (the two points of view, moreover, corresponding in such a way that they can only be separated artificially) extending from the unmanifested downwards to gross manifestation, passing through the intermediary of formless manifestation and then of subtle manifestation; and, whether we are dealing with the "macrocosm" or with the "microcosm," such is the general order which must be followed in the development of the possibilities of manifestation.

The elements about which we shall now be speaking are the *svayas* enumerated by the *Śākhya*, with the exception, of course, of the first and the last, that is, of *Pradhāna* and *Paraka*. We have seen that, among these *svayas*, some are regarded as "productive productions" and others as "unproductive productions": a question therefore suggests itself in this connection: is this division equivalent to the division we have just specified in respect of the degrees of manifestation, or does it not at least roughly correspond with it? For example, if we look

DEGREES OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION

ourselves to the point of view of individuality, we might be inclined to refer the *asuras* of the first group to the subtle state and those of the second to the gross state, the more so since, in a certain sense, subtle manifestation is productive of gross manifestation, while the latter is not productive of any further state : but the matter is not really quite so simple. In point of fact, in the first group we have *Asuras* first of all, which is the fearless element to which we were alluding just now, as to the other *asuras* which are included with it, *elephas* and the *anandras*, they do indeed belong to the domain of subtle manifestation. Again, in the second group, the *Alakus* unquestionably belong to the domain of gross manifestation, since they are the corporeal element : but moreover, not being corporeal, must, in itself at least, be referred to subtle manifestation, although its activity is also corporeal in relation to gross manifestation ; while the other *indriyas* have in some sort a twofold aspect, being conceivable at the same time as faculties and as organs, psychically as well as corporally therefore, which is also to say both in the subtle and in the gross state. It must, moreover, be clearly understood that that part of subtle manifestation which is taken into consideration in all these circumstances is really only the portion affecting the human individual state in its extra-corporeal modalities ; and, superior as these may be to the corporeal modality, inasmuch as they contain its immediate principle (their domain extending at the same time much farther), nevertheless, if we situate them in the totality of universal Existence, they still belong to that degree of Existence in which the human state as a whole is situated. The same remark also applies when we say that subtle manifestation is productive of gross manifestation : for this to be strictly accurate however, it is necessary, in the case of the former, to apply the restriction we have just mentioned, since the same relationship cannot be established in respect of those other states which, though likewise individual states, are not human states and therefore differ entirely as to

DEGREES OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION

their conditions (other than the condition imposed by the presence of form); for these states must nevertheless also be included in subtle manifestation, as we have already explained, from the moment that we accept the human individuality as a term of comparison as we must inevitably do, while clearly bearing in mind that the human individual state is really neither more nor less important than any other state whatsoever.

One last observation is called for, in speaking of the order of development of the possibilities of manifestation, or of the order in which the elements corresponding to the different phases of this development should be enumerated, great care must be taken to explain that such an order implies a purely logical succession, signifying, however, a real ontological connection, and that there cannot be any question at all here of a temporal succession. Development is time, indeed, only corresponds with a special condition of existence, which is one of those conditions defining the domain in which the human state is contained; and there are an indefinite number of other modes of development equally possible, and included also within universal manifestation. Human individuality cannot therefore be related in the order of time to other states of the being, since these, in a general way, are extra-temporal: and that is also true even when it is only a question of states which likewise belong to formal manifestation. It might further be added that certain extensions of the human individuality, outside its corporeal modality, are already freed from time, without on that account being exempt from the general conditions of the state to which this individuality belongs; these extensions are really situated in more prolonged states of that state, and we shall doubtless in other studies have occasion to explain just how such prolongations may be reached through the suppression of one or other of the conditions which together contribute to make up the corporeal world. Such being the case, it is all the more apparent that there cannot be any question of the temporal

DEGREES OF INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION

condition applying outside this same state, nor, consequently, of its governing the relation of the integral human state with other states ; and that is even less admissible when it is a question of a principle common to all the states of manifestation, or of an element which, though indeed manifested, is nevertheless superior to all formal manifestations, as is the element which we have to consider next.

CHAPTER VII

BUDHI OR THE HIGHER INTELLECT

THE first degree of the manifestation of *Atma*, taking this expression in the sense explained in the last chapter, is the higher intellect (*Buddhi*), which, as we have seen above, is also called *Mahat* or the "great principle"; it is the second of the twenty-five principles of the *Satvidya*, and the first therefore of all the productions of *Prakriti*. This principle still pertains to the universal order, since it is formless; we must not, however, forget that it already belongs to manifestation, and therefore proceeds from *Prakriti*, for all manifestation, at whatever degree we take it, necessarily implies the two correlative and complementary essences, *Parada* and *Prakriti*, "Essence" and "Substance." It is none the less true that *Buddhi* transcends the domain not only of human individuality but of every individual state whatsoever, and it is this which justifies its other name of *Mahat*: it is never really individualized therefore, and it is not until the next stage, that of the particular (or rather "particularist") consciousness of the "ego," that we shall find individuality realized.

Buddhi, considered in relation to the human individuality or to any other individual state, is, then, its immediate but transcendent principle, just as, from the point of view of universal Existence, formless manifestation is the principle of formal manifestation; and it is at the same time what may be called the deposition of the Personality in manifestation, therefore that which unifies the being throughout the indefinite multiplicity of its individual states (the human state, in its strict estimate, being but one state among all the rest). In other words, if we view the "Self" (*Atma*), or Personality, as the Spiritual

BUDDHI OR THE HIGHER INTELLECT

Sat¹ which shines at the centre of the entire being, Buddhi will be the ray directly emanating from this Sat and illuminating in its entirety the particular individual state that more especially concerns us, while at the same time linking it to the other individual states of the same being, or rather, more generally still, to all the manifested states (individual or non-individual) of that being, and, beyond these, to the centre itself. Furthermore it should be remarked here, without however going into the question so far as to interrupt the course of our exposition, that, owing to the fundamental unity of the being in all its states, the centre of each state, where this spiritual ray is projected, should be regarded as virtually, if not effectively, identified with the centre of the entire being; and it is for this reason that any state whatsoever, the human state as well as any other, can be taken as a basis for the realisation of the Supreme Identity. It is precisely in this sense, and in virtue of this identification, that one may say, as we did in the first place, that *Paradev* itself dwells at the centre of the human individuality, that is to say, at the point where the interaction of the spiritual ray with the realm of the vital possibilities determines the "living soul" (*ĥotma*).²

Furthermore Buddhi, like everything that proceeds from the potentialities of *Ĥodra*, participates in the three *gunas*; that explains why, when viewed from the standpoint of distinctive knowledge (*vijñāna*), it is regarded as tinsary, and, in the sphere of universal Existence, it is then identified with the divine Trimurti; "Māder is conceived distinctively as three Gods (in the sense of

¹ As to the sense in which this expression should be taken, we would refer the reader to the remarks properly made concerning the "Universal Type."

² Clearly we are not entering in this instance in a metaphysical point, but in what might be analogically called a metaphysical point. Although with the previous however that with no expression could not be allowed to underlie the notion of the "sacred" — or *Ĥodra*, once placed in contact with this particular and consequent manifestation of *Ĥodra*, so that its separate existence is really denied. The geometrical comparisons referred to will likewise be set forth in subsequent work, together with all the developments to which it leads itself.

BUDDHI OR THE HIGHER INTELLECT

these aspects of the intelligible Light, for this is the real meaning of the Sanskrit word *Draśa*, of which the Latin word *Deus* is, moreover, etymologically the exact equivalent¹; through the influence of the three gunas, being one single manifestation (*maṇi*) in three Gods. In the universal order, it is the Divinity (*Īśvara*, not in Himself, but under His three principal aspects as *Brahmā*, *Pūṣa* and *Śiva*, constituting the *Trimūrti*, or "triple manifestation") : but regarded distributively (under the aspect of "separativity," which is, moreover, purely contingent) it belongs (without however being itself individualised) to individual beings (to whom it communicates the possibility of participating in the divine attributes, that is to say, in the very nature of Universal Being, the Principle of all existence).² It is easy to see that *Buddhi* is here considered in its respective relation with the first two of the three *Paraśakti* which are spokes of in the *Śaṅkara-Chakr* : in the "macrocosmic" order the "irragatable" *Paraśakti* is *Īśvara* Himself, of whom the *Trimūrti* is the expression in manifested mode (we are speaking, of course, of formless manifestation, for there is nothing individual about it) ; and it is stated that the other *Paraśakti* is "disseminated among all beings." Similarly, in the "microcosmic" order, *Buddhi* may be viewed relatively to the Personality (*Jīva*) and relatively to the "living soul" (*Ātma*), the latter moreover only being the reflection of the Personality in the individual human state, a reflection which could not exist without the mediation of *Buddhi*. To recall here the symbol of the sun and its reflected image in the water, *Buddhi* is, as we have stated, the ray which determines the formation of the

¹ Many can be given to the word "God" the meaning that it has unfortunately assumed in Western languages, its use in the present would make nonsense from the Hindu (not at much as from the Christian or Moslem) point of view; still, as we pointed out before, it could then only apply to *Īśvara* exclusively, in His indivisible unity which is that of Universal Being, whatever multiplicity of aspects can be considered as pertaining to it in a secondary way.

² *Major-Parvas*. It will be noticed that *Buddhi* is not mentioned in the *Upaniṣad* of the *Īśa* Upaniṣad.

BUDDHI OR THE HIGHER INTELLECT

image and at the same time unites it with its luminous source.

It is in virtue of the twofold relationship which has just been indicated, and of this function of intermediary between the Personality and the individuality, that we may regard the intellect, in spite of the inevitable inadequacy of such a way of speaking, as passing in some sort from the state of universal potentiality to the individualised state, but without really ceasing to be such as it was, since this apparent passage only comes about through its intersection with the particular domain constituted by certain conditions of existence defining the individuality in question ; as a result of this intersection it then produces the individual consciousness (*abhidhā*), implied in the "living soul" (*jīva*) in which it is inherent. As we have already pointed out, this consciousness, which is the third principle of the *Sākhya*, gives rise to the notion of the "ego" (*aham*, whence the name *abhidhā*, literally "that which makes the me"), since its proper function is to establish the individual conviction (*abhimatā*), that is to say, positively the notion that "I am" concerned with external (*bāhya*) and internal (*adhyātma*) objects, which are respectively the objects of perception (*pragvaktā*) and contemplation (*dhya*) ; and the sum total of these objects is described by the term *idam*, "this," when it is thus conceived as in opposition to *aham* or "me," a purely relative opposition, however, and for that reason quite different from that which modern philosophers claim to establish between "subject" and "object" or between "mind" and "things." Thus the individual consciousness proceeds directly, but simply as a conditioned modality, from the intellectual principle, and, in its turn, produces all the other principles or elements specially attaching to the human individuality. These elements we shall now consider in greater detail.

CHAPTER VIII

MAHAT OR THE INWARD SENSE :

THE FIVE INTERNAL FACULTIES OF SENSATION AND ACTION

IN its list of the *avastha*, after individual consciousness (*ekadashin*), the *Shukhyu* goes on to describe the five *manodhar*, subtle elementary determinations, incorporated therefore and outwardly imperceptible, belonging to the same group of productive productions. In an immediate sense they constitute respectively the principles of the five *dhatus* or corporeal and sensible elements and receive their definite expression in the particular conditions of individual existence prevailing at the level of the human state. The word *avastharu* literally means an "assignment" (*avah*, *avahana*, determination) delimiting the proper sphere of a given quality (*sat* or *sat*, *avastha* pronounced, "that," taken here in the sense of "quiddity," like the Arabic *dhif*) in universal existence ; but this is not the place to enter into fuller details on this subject. We will merely remark that the five *avastharu* are usually indicated by the names of the sensible qualities : auditive or sonorous (*shabdar*), tangible (*sparshar*), visible (*rūpa*, with the double sense of form and colour), sapid (*rasa*), olfactory (*gandhar*) ; but these qualities must be looked upon here as existing in a relatively principal and "non-developed" state only, since it is through the *dhatus* alone that they will be actually manifested in the sensible order ; furthermore the relation of the *manodhar* to the *dhatus* is analogous, in its relative degree, to that of "Essence" to "Substance," so that the term "elementary *avastharu*"

¹ It should be noted that these words *sat* and *dhif* are phonetically equivalent to the *sa* and *da* in the English *star* which before the same meaning

MANAS OR THE INWARD SENSE

could be applied accurately enough to the *śamānīnāṁ*.¹ The five *dhātavaḥ*, in the order of their production or of their manifestation (an order parallel to that just indicated for the *śamānīnāṁ*, since a corresponding sensible quality goes with each element) are Ether (*Ākāśaḥ*), Air (*Vātaḥ*), Fire (*Tejaḥ*), Water (*Āp*) and Earth (*Prithaḥ* or *Prithivī*): and it is from these that the whole of gross or corporeal manifestation is made up.

Between the *śamānīnāṁ* and the *dhātavaḥ*, and conforming with the latter the group of "unproductive productions," there are eleven distinct and specifically individual faculties, which proceed from *śabdabhāva*, and which, at the same time, all participate in the five *śamānīnāṁ*. Of the eleven faculties in question ten are external, five of sensation and five of action; the eleventh, which is concerned with both these functions, is the inward sense or mental faculty (*manas*), and this is directly attached to consciousness (*śabdabhāva*).² It is so *manas* that we must refer individual thought, which belongs to the formal order (and which includes reason as well as memory and imagination); it is in no way inherent in the transcendent intellect (*Buddhiḥ*), the attributes of which are essentially formless. It is worth reminding in this connection that, for Aristotle also, pure intellect is of a transcendent order and can claim knowledge of universal principles as its proper object: this knowledge, which is not discursive in any respect, is acquired directly and immediately by intellectual intuition. To avoid any misunderstanding it should be added that this intuition has nothing at all to do with the so-called "intuition" of a merely sensitive and vital order, which plays such a prominent part in the decidedly anti-metaphysical theories of certain contemporary philosophers.

¹ It is in a more closely resembling this conception of the *śamānīnāṁ* that Pāṇi and Christ, in his interpretation of Genesis (La *Genèse* *Śamānīnāṁ* *śabdabhāva*), make use of the expression "multiplicity demonstrable."

² Concerning the production of these various principles, borrowed from the "unproductive" part of verse, cf. *Śamānīnāṁ* *Śamānīnāṁ* (The Law of Manas), *Śamānīnāṁ* *Śamānīnāṁ* in 10.

³ This was Aristotle. Aristotle's meaning when he said that "man (or an individual) never thinks without images," that is to say without forms.

MANAS OR THE INWARD SENSE

As for the development of the different faculties of individual man, it is enough to quote the teaching of the *Brahma-Sutra* on this subject: "The intellect, the inward sense, and also the faculties of sensation and action, are developed (in manifestation) and re-absorbed (into the unmanifested) in a similar sequence (except that re-absorption proceeds in an inverse order to that of development),¹ and this sequence always follows that of the elements from which these faculties proceed as regards their constitution² (with the exception, however, of the intellect, which is developed in the *foramen* order prior to the determination of any formal or properly individual principle). As to *Paraśa* (or *Ātma*), an emanation (in so far as it is regarded as the Personality of a being); is not a birth (even in the widest meaning of the word),³ neither is it a production (implying a starting-point for its actual existence, as is the case for everything that proceeds from *Prakṛti*). Our reason in fact assigns to it any limitation (by any particular condition of existence), since, being identified with the Supreme *Brahma*, it partakes of its infinite nature⁴ (implying the possession of the divine attributes, at least virtually and even actually in so far as this participation is effectively realized in the Supreme Identity, not to speak of all that lies beyond any attribution whatsoever, since here we are contemplating the Supreme *Brahma*, which is *avyakta*, and not merely *Brahma* as *vyakta*, that

¹ The reader must be reminded that it is in no wise an order of temporal sequence that is in question.

² Since this sequence may be shown in the formation of the *Ātma*, depending on whether the embryo is considered as the subtle or the gross body, that is to say in *Bhūta* or in *Prāṇa*.

³ It is, as *paraśa*, in fact, to apply the name of "birth" or "death" to the beginning and end of any state whatever, that is to say, of an existence in relation with all manifestation, and not in the broader sense alone. It will be explained further on, the passage from one state to another is then birth and is not a death, meaning as it is a return or return to the unmanifest or to the independent state.

⁴ The word "infinite," when it is thus applied unambiguously, comes to be in any way a translation of "independence," *brahma*, whatever position a limitation of any kind should be ascribed. Similarly, the word "intellect" when applied to Universal Being or even beyond Being, loses its usual and epistemological meaning entirely, together with the idea of "knowing," which is implied in it.

MANAS OR THE INWARD SENSE

is to say *Jñāna*).¹ It is active, but only in principle (therefore "actionless")² for this activity (*darśina*) is not essential to it nor inherent in it, but is simply essential and contingent (merely relative to its states of manifestation). As the carpenter, grasping in his hand his axe and his other tools and then laying them aside, enjoys tranquillity and repose, so the *Atmā*, in its union with its instruments (by means of which its principal faculties are expressed and developed in each of its states of manifestation, and which are then nothing but the manifestations of these faculties with their respective organs), is active (although this activity in no way affects its unmost nature), and, in relinquishing them, enjoys repose and tranquillity (in the 'maiden' from which, in itself, it never departs).³

The various faculties of sensation and action (indicated by the word *grāha* in a secondary acceptance) are eleven in number: five of sensation (*indriyādhyakṣa* or *pañcendriyāḥ*, means or instruments of knowledge in their own particular sphere), five of action (*karmendriyāḥ*), and the inward sense (*manas*). Where a greater number (*chakras*) is given, the term *śubhṛ* is employed in its widest and most comprehensive sense, distinguishing within *manas*, by reason of the plurality of its functions, the intellect (not in itself and in so far as it belongs to the transcendent order, but as a particular determination relative to the individual), the individual consciousness (*ātmanā*, from which *manas* cannot be separated), and the inward sense properly so called (what the Scholastic philosophers term "*intellus sensus*"). Where a lesser number (usually seven) is given, the same term is applied in a more restricted manner: thus, seven sensible organs are specified, the

¹ The possession of the divine attribute is called in Sanskrit *anantary* or 'containing a real "contaminability" with *Jñāna*.

² *Maṇḍūkya* was right in also affirming the point that the prime mover of all things (or the principle of movement) must itself be motionless, which amounts to saying, in other words, that the principle of all motion must be "actionless."

³ *Prakāśa-Bhāṣā*, *Adhyāya III*, *Paśā* 3, *śloka* 14 to 17 and 21 to 27.

MANAS OR THE INWARD SENSE.

two eyes, the two ears, the two nostrils and the mouth or tongue (so that, in this case, we are dealing merely with the seven openings or orifices of the head). The eleven faculties mentioned above (although indicated collectively by the term *prāṇa*) are not (as are the five *ajās* of which we shall speak later) simple modifications of the *māhā-prāṇa* or principal vital act (respiration, with the assimilation ensuing from it), but distinct principles (from the special point of view of human individuality).¹

The term *prāṇa* in its most usual acceptation, really means "vital breath"; but in certain Vedic texts, it serves to describe something which, in the universal sense, is identified in principle with *Brahma* itself, as when it is said that in deep sleep (*suṣupti*), all the faculties are re-absorbed into *prāṇa*, since "while a man sleeps without dreaming, his spiritual principle (*Ātma* viewed in relation to him) is one with *Brahma*,"² this state being beyond distraction and therefore truly super-individual: that is why the word *suṣupta*, "he sleeps," is interpreted as *manas ajāta* "he has entered into his own (Self)."³

As to the word *indriya*, it really means "power," which is also the primary meaning of the word "faculty"; but, by extension, it comes to mean, as has already been pointed out, both the faculty and its bodily organ, which are thus described by one and the same word and which are considered as constituting in combination a single instrument, either of knowledge (*jñānī* or *jāna*, these terms being here taken in their widest sense), or of action (*karma*). The five instruments of sensation are: the ear or hearing (*śrotra*), the skin or touch (*śabdā*), the eye or sight (*akṣarā*), the tongue or taste (*rasanā*), the nose or smell (*ghrāṇā*), being enumerated thus in the order of development of the senses, which is that of the corresponding

¹ *Śaṅkara* *Śaṅkara*, *Atyāśraya* II, *Prāṇa* 2, *ajās* 1 to 5.

² Commentary of Śaṅkara on the *Brahma-sūtra*, *Atyāśraya* III, *Prāṇa* 2, *ajās* 7.

³ *Chāṇḍogya* Upaniṣad, *Pragya* VI, *Ātma* VIII, *ajās* 1. To give without seeing; that that is a case of interpretation by the method of *śaṅkara* and not the method of *śaṅkara*.

MANAS OR THE INWARD SENSE

elements (*dhātu*); but, to explain this correspondence in detail, it would be necessary to discuss fully the conditions of corporeal existence, which we cannot undertake to do here. The five instruments of action are the organs of excretion (*palāś*), the gustatory organs (*spandha*), the hands (*pāda*), the feet (*pāda*) and lastly the voice or organ of speech (*vāk*),¹ which is reckoned as the teeth. *Manas* must be regarded as the eleventh, fulfilling in its own nature a double function of service both towards perception and towards action, and partaking in consequence of the properties of each, which it centralises to a certain extent within itself.²

According to the *Sākhya*, these faculties with their respective organs are (distinguishing these faculties in *manas*) the thirteen instruments of knowledge in the sphere of human individuality (for the end of action is not in action itself but only in so far as it relates to knowledge): three are internal and ten external, compared to three animals and ten gates (consciousness being inherent in the former, but not in the latter when viewed dissociately). A bodily sense percipient, and an organ of action executes (the one being, as it were, an "entry," and the other an "outgoing": there are here two successive and complementary phases, of which the first is a centripetal and the second a centrifugal movement); between the two, the inward sense (*manas*) examines; consciousness (*śaśvata*) makes the individual application, that is to say the actualisation of the perception by the "ego," of which it hitherto becomes part as a secondary modification; and, finally, the pure intellect (*Buddhi*) transposes the data of the preceding faculties into the Universal.

¹ This word *vāk* is identical with the Latin *vox*.

² *Atmanah-Chakras-Sādhana*, Volume II, Chapter IV, p. 100.

CHAPTER IX

THE ENVELOPES OF THE "SELF," THE FIVE VĀRAS OR VĪRAJĀ FUNCTIONS

Periukā or *Ātāt*, manifesting itself as *śabdāt* in the living form of the individual being, is regarded, according to the *Vādasūtra*, as clothing itself in a series of "envelopes" (*śūlakā*) or successive vehicles, representing so many phases of its manifestation; it would be altogether wrong, however, to compare these envelopes to "bodies," since it is the last phase only that belongs to the corporeal order. It is important to note, moreover, that *Ātāt* cannot, strictly speaking, be said to be actually contained within such envelopes, since, by its very nature, it is not susceptible of any limitation and is in no way conditioned by any state of manifestation whatsoever.¹

The first envelope (*śabdānāyaka-śūla*, the suffix *nāyaka* signifying "made of" or "consisting of" whatever is denoted by the word to which it is joined) is none other than the totality of the possibilities of manifestation which *Ātāt* comprises within itself, in its "permanent actuality" in the peripheral and undifferentiated state. It is called "made of *śabdātā*" (*śabdātā*), because the "Self," in this primordial state, enjoys the plenitude of its own being, and it is in no way really distinct from the "Self"; it is superior to conditioned existence, which pertains to it, and it is situated at the level of pure Being; that is why it is regarded as characteristic of *Ātātā*.² Here, there-

¹ In the *Pañcatantra Upaniṣad*, Vāḍa II, Anuvāḍa 8, śloka 1, and Vāḍa III, Anuvāḍa 10, śloka 3, the designation of the various envelopes are referred directly to the "Self," according as it is conditioned in relation to this or that state of manifestation.

² Whereas the other designations (*śūla* of the four following envelopes) can be considered as applicable to *śabdāt*, the envelope called *śabdānāyaka* applies not only to *Ātātā* but also, by transposition, even to *Parameśvara* or the Supreme Being and that is why it is that in the *Pañcatantra Upaniṣad*, Vāḍa II, Anuvāḍa 8, śloka 1. Referring then that which consists of distinguishing knowledge (*jñānānāyaka*) to the other superior *śūla* (pure *śabdāt*) which occurs in *śloka* (*śabdānāyaka*). Cf. *Radha-Krishna Atmaphya*, I, Vāḍa 10, śloka 10 to 12.

THE ENVELOPES OF THE "SELF"

fore, we are in the formless order; it is only when this envelope is viewed in relation to formal manifestation, and in so far as the principle of the latter is contained in it, that it can be said to represent principal or causal form (*adharma-dharma*), that by which form will be manifested and actualized in the succeeding stages.

The second envelope (*ajñānāmaya-dhāra*) is formed by the directly reflected Light (in the intelligible sense) of integral and universal Knowledge (*Jñāna*, the particle or implying the distinctive mode)¹; it is composed of five "elementary essences" (*aravindas*), "conceivable" but not "perceptible," in their subtle state; and it issues out of the conjunction of the higher intellect (*Buddhi*) with the principal faculties of perception proceeding respectively from the five *aravindas*, and the external development of which constitutes the five senses of the corporeal individuality.² The third envelope (*manomaya-dhāra*), in which the constituents of the preceding envelope are linked up with the unword sense (*manas*), especially brings into play the mental consciousness³ or thinking faculty; this, as we have previously explained, belongs exclusively to the individual and formal order, and its development arises from the radiation, in reflective mode, of the higher intellect within a determinate individual state, which is in this case the human state.⁴ The fourth envelope (*prāṇamaya-dhāra*) comprises the faculties which proceed from the "vital breath" (*prāṇa*), that is to say, the five *rajās* (modalities of this *prāṇa*), as well as the faculties of action and sensation (these last already existing

¹ The Sanskrit word *vidya* has the primary root as the Greek *vidēin*, which it also shares with the Latin *videre*. It expresses an idea of perception or of generation, indicates the being "known," whatever it knows and realizes itself through that knowledge.

² It is starting from this second envelope that the term, *dhāra* properly applied, especially if this word, as interpreted by the metaphysicists of India, be given the sense of "dependent upon the six principles." That is to say upon *Buddhi* (or upon *dhāra* which is derived directly from it and is the first principle in the individual order) and the five *aravindas* (*Upasāra*, *Śānta*, *Śānta*, *Śānta*, *Śānta*).

³ By the expression, we mean something representing a more advanced degree of determination than individual consciousness, pure and simple. It might be said to be the medium of the sense of mind and intellect.

THE ENVELOPES OF THE "SELF"

principally in the two preceding envelopes as purely "conceptive" faculties, at which stage, indeed, there could be no question of any sort of action, any more than of any external perception). The combination of these last envelopes (*vijadānamaya*, *manomaya* and *prāṇamaya*) constitutes the subtle form (*śūlakā-śarīra* or *dehā-śarīra*), as opposed to the gross or corporeal form (*sthūlakā-śarīra*); thus we meet again here with the distinction between the two modes of formal manifestation which we have referred to on several previous occasions.

The five vital functions or actions are called *vāyā*, although they are not strictly speaking air or wind (which is the general meaning of the word *vāya* or *vāta*, derived from the root *vā*, to go, to move, and usually denoting the element air, one of the characteristic properties of which is mobility),¹ since they belong to the subtle and not to the corporeal state; as we have said above, they are modalities of the "vital breath" (*prāṇa*, or more generally *śrī*) considered chiefly in relation to respiration. They are: (1) aspiration, that is, respiration regarded as ascending in its initial phase (*prāṇa*, in the strictest sense of this word), and attracting the still unindividualized elements of the cosmic environment, causing them to participate, by assimilation, in the individual consciousness; (2) inspiration, considered as descending in a succeeding phase (*apāṇa*), whereby these elements penetrate into the individuality; (3) a phase intermediary between the two preceding ones (*vyāṇa*), consisting, on the one hand, of all the reciprocal actions and reactions which are produced upon the contact of the individual with the surrounding elements, and, on the other hand, of the various resultant vital movements, of which the circulation of the blood is the corresponding movement in the bodily

¹ We refer the reader to the previous footnote concerning the *vāyā* application of the Sanskrit word *dehā*, which corresponds fairly closely to the English word *body*.

² The root *vā* occurs again, with similar meaning, in the Greek *vaipos*, "breath" or "wind" and in the Latin *ventus*, "wind," the original and proper meaning of which is precisely "wind breath."

THE ENVELOPES OF THE "SELF"

organism; (4) expiration (*adha*), which projects the breath, while transforming it, beyond the limits of the restricted individuality (that is, the individuality reduced simply to those modalities which are commonly developed in all men) into the sphere of the possibilities of the extended individuality, viewed in its integrality;¹ (5) digestion, or inner substantial assimilation (*Avadha*), by which the elements absorbed become an integral part of the individuality.² It is clearly stated that all this is not purely a matter of the operation of one or of several bodily organs, it is, in fact, easy to realise that it refers not merely to the analogically corresponding physiological functions, but rather to vital assimilation in the widest possible sense.

The corporeal or gross form (*sthula-sharira*) is the fifth and last envelope, the one which, for the human state, corresponds to the most external mode of manifestation; it is the elementary envelope (*asaamsya-shula*), composed of the five sensible elements (*bhutas*) out of which all bodies are constituted. It assimilates to itself the combined elements received in nutriment (*anna*, a word derived from the verbal root *ad* to eat),³ secreting the finer parts, which remain in the organic circulation, and excreting or rejecting the coarser, excepting those however which are deposited in the bones. As a result of this assimilation the earthy substances become the flesh, the watery substances, the blood, and the igneous substances, the fat, the marrow and the nervous system (phosphoric matter); for there are corporeal substances in which the nature of one element or another predominates, although they are all formed by the union of the five elements.⁴

¹ It should be observed that the word "expire" means both "to give the breath" (as interpreted and "to die" (as regard of the bodily part of the human individuality). Both these meanings are related to the sense in question.

² *Pratya-dhava* adhyaya II, Pada 2, verses 1 to 15. Cp. *Chandogya Upanishad*, Prapancha V, Khanda 25 to 27; *Manu Smriti*, Prapancha II, shloka 4.

³ The root in the case is that of the Latin *edre*, and also, though in more distant form, that of the English "eat" and the German *essen*.

⁴ *Pratya-dhava* adhyaya II, Pada 2, verse 21. Cp. *Chandogya Upanishad*, Prapancha 4, Khanda 2, shloka 1 to 3.

THE ENVELOPES OF THE 'SELF'

Every organic being, dwelling in such a bodily form, possesses, in a more or less complete degree of development, the eleven individual faculties of which we have spoken above, and, as we have also seen, these faculties are manifested in the bodily organism by means of the eleven corresponding organs (*avayava*, a name which is also applied in the subtle state, but only by analogy with the gross state). According to Śaṅkarācārya,¹ three classes of organic beings may be distinguished, according to their mode of reproduction : (1) the viviparous (*jīvaṃśa*, or *maṃśa*, or again, *janṇaṃśa*), such as man and the other mammals ; (2) the oviparous (*śaḍaṃśa*), such as birds, reptiles, fish and insects ; (3) the germiviparous (*śūbhṇṇaṃśa*) which includes both the lower animals and plants, the former mobile, being born chiefly in water, while the latter which are immobile are usually born in the earth; however, according to sundry passages in the *Pāṇi*, nutriment (*anna*), that is to say vegetation (*śākhā*) also proceeds from water, since it is rain (*varsha*) which fertilises the earth.²

¹ Commentary on the *Bhāṣya-Sūtra*, *Līṅgā* III, *Prāṇa* 1, *śloka* 10 and 11. Cp. *Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣad*, *Prapāṇika* VI, *Khanda* 3, *śloka* 1, also *Isaṅgya Upaniṣad*, *Khanda* 7, *śloka* 3. The latter text, besides the three classes of living beings mentioned in the others, mentions a fourth class, namely those born of damp heat (*śūbhṇṇa*), but this class can be taken as to the half-born class.

² See especially *Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣad*, *Prapāṇika* I, *Khanda* 1, *śloka* 1. "Vegetables are the substance (made) of water" : *Prapāṇika* 3, *Khanda* 1, *śloka* 1 and *Prapāṇika* 3, *Khanda* 4, *śloka* 2 : *anna* arises (it proceeds) from water. The word *annam* literally means "supper" and it has been seen earlier on that it also signifies "nourishment" or "nourish" : moreover in French also the words "nour" and "nourish" like the corresponding English words have the same root (*nour*) which is at the same time that of the Latin *nourire* (French *nourir*) by reason of the analogy which exists between nutritive assimilation in the bodily order and nutritive assimilation in the mental and intellectual order. It should also be noted that the word *anna* sometimes refers to the substance with which, which is the last in the order of development, and which is also derived from the element *āp* (water) which, especially according to *Chāṇḍogya Upaniṣad*, *Prapāṇika* VI, *Khanda* 3, *śloka* 4.

CHAPTER X

THE ESSENTIAL UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF" IN ALL THE STATES OF THE BEING

At this stage it is necessary to emphasize a point of fundamental importance. All the principles or elements we have been speaking about, which are described as distinct, are indeed so when viewed from the individual standpoint, but only from that standpoint, for in reality they merely constitute so many manifested modalities of the "Universal Spirit" (*Atmā*). In other words, although accidental and contingent in so far as they are manifested, they serve as the expression of certain essential possibilities of *Atmā* (those which, from their very nature, are possibilities of manifestation); and these possibilities, in principle and in their basic reality, are in no wise distinct from *Atmā*. This is why they must be considered, in the Universal (and no longer in relation to individual beings), as being in reality *Brahma* itself, which is "without duality," and outside of which there is nothing, either manifested or unmanifested.¹ Besides, anything which leaves something outside itself cannot be infinite, being limited by that very thing which it excludes; and thus the World, taking the expression as meaning the whole of universal manifestation, is only distinguishable from *Brahma* in an illusory manner, while on the contrary *Brahma* is absolutely "distinct from that which it pervades,"² that is, from the World, since we cannot apply any of the determinative attributes to it which pertain to the World,

¹ Nityātmā, the Atmā, in his *Pratīti* as *Ucya* (*Pratītiśānti*), only in the same sense.

² *Atmā*—may he be called—in respect from all comparison as well as from every dual, contrast or opposition. There is moreover perfect agreement in this respect also between the Vedānta and Śākhya systems.

³ See the text of the *Pratīti* on the *Knowledge of the Self* (*Atmāśānti*) of Śaṅkarācārya, which will be quoted further on.

UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF"

and since universal manifestation in its entirety is rigorously ad in relation to Its Infinity.

As we have already pointed out elsewhere, this reciprocity of relationship entails the formal condemnation of "pantheism," as well as of "immanatism" of any sort; and the *Background-God* also asserts the same thing very clearly in the following terms: "All beings are in *It* and I am not Myself in them. . . . My Being upholds beings and, without being itself in them, it is through It that they exist."¹ Again, one may say that *Shodoku* is the absolute Whole for the very reason that It is infinite, while, on the other hand, though all things are in *Shodoku*, they are not *Shodoku* when viewed from the standpoint of distinction, that is to say, in their quality of relative and conditioned things, their existence as such being, moreover, nothing but an illusion from the standpoint of supreme Reality. That which is asserted of things and which cannot apply to *Shodoku* is but an expression of relativity, and at the same time, this relativity being illusory, all distinction is equally illusory, because one of its terms vanishes when brought into the presence of the other, nothing being capable of entering into correlation with the Infinite. It is solely in principle that all things are *Shodoku*, but also it is that alone which constitutes their fundamental reality, this it is that must never be lost sight of if there is to be a proper understanding of what is to follow.²

¹ *Background-God* IX, 4 and 5.

² We will here quote a Danish text in which the same ideas are expressed.

"Do not inquire whether the Principle is in this or in that. It is in all beings. That is why It is given the epithet of great, repeated, secure, approved, solid. That which caused beings to be beings is not their subject or for some given beings. That which caused all beings to be limited, is Their Mystery, reality. As for manifestation, the Principle protects the existence of its phases, but is not that movement here involved in that movement! It is the author of cause and of effect (the great reveal, but is not the cause and effects particular and manifested). It is the author of continuance and disappearance (birth and death, changes of aspect, but is not final continuation or disappearance). Everything principle, form is used as needed by and under Its influence. It is in all things, up the disappearance of a form, but it is not identical with beings, being neither differentiated nor limited."

(*Background-God*, chapter IV(1). French translation by Father Wagner, pages 215-216)

UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF"

* No distinction (bearing upon contingent modifications, such as the distinction between the agent, the act and the end or the result of that act) invalidates the essential unity and identity of *Brahma* as cause (*hitha*) and effect (*bhava*).¹ The sea is the same as its waters and does not differ (in nature) in any way from them, although the waves, the foam, the spray, the drops and other accidental modifications which these waters undergo exist apart or conjointly as different from one another (when considered distinctively, either under the aspect of succession or of simultaneity, but without their nature coming on that account to be the same).² An effect is not other (in essence) than its cause (although the cause, on the contrary, is more than the effect), *Brahma* is one (as Being) and without duality (as Supreme Principle); itself, it is not separated (by any limitations) from its modifications (formal as well as formal); it is *Amal* (in every possible state), and *Amal* (in itself, in the unconditioned state) is It (and not other than It).³ The same earth yields diamonds and other precious minerals, crystal rocks and common worthless stones; the same soil produces a diversity of plants offering the greatest variety of leaves, flowers and fruits; the same nutriment is converted in the organism into blood, flesh and various excrements, such as hair and nails. As milk is spontaneously changed into curds and water into ice (but without that conversion from one state into another implying any change of nature), so

¹ It is to suppose that *Brahma* is *Adopted*, and to suppose that It is *Adopted*, the latter is the "Supreme" or *Para-Brahma* and the former is the "Non-Supreme" or *Apara-Brahma* (also in *Satthava*). But as we are not judges that *Brahma* ceases in any way to be "without duality" (without), for the "Non-Supreme" itself is not different as to be as It is distinguished from the "Supreme" just as the effect is not truly and essentially different from the cause. It should be noted that *Para-Brahma* and *Apara-Brahma* must never be translated improperly as "supreme *Brahma*" and "inferior *Brahma*," for such expressions presuppose a comparison of a condition which cannot possibly exist.

² This comparison with the sea and its waters shows that *Brahma* is here envisaged as *Universal Principle*, which is the absolute totality of particular possibilities.

³ This is the very formula of the "Supreme Identity," in the most concrete form that it is possible to give to it.

UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF"

Brahma modifies itself in diverse ways (in the indefinite multiplicity of universal manifestation), without the aid of instruments or external means of any kind whatever (and without its unity and identity being affected thereby, without it being possible to say, therefore, that it is modified in reality, although all things only exist in effect as its modifications).¹ Thus the spider spins its web out of its own substance, subtle beings take diverse (incorporeal) forms, and the lotus grows from marsh to marsh without organs of locomotion. That *Brahma* is indivisible and without parts (as It is), is no objection (to that conception of universal multiplicity in its unity, or rather in its "oneness"); it is not its totality (eternally immutable) which is modified in the appearance of the World (nor any of its parts, since It has none), but it is itself viewed under the special aspect of distinction or of differentiation, that is, as *ajanya* or *avasthanta*; and, if It can be viewed thus, that is because It comprises all possibilities within itself, without their being in any sense parts of itself.²

¹ It must not be forgotten, in order to avoid this apparent difficulty, that we are here well beyond the distinction of *Parashakti* and *Parameśvara* and that both these two, being strictly united in Being, are with all the most exactness included in the supreme *Brahma*, and hence appear as two complementary aspects of the *Pratirokta*, if one is permitted to use such an expression, for it is indeed relatively to our own conception only that they constitute two aspects — in so far as it is possible, that is the aspect analogous to *Pratirokta* — as to the manner as it is manifested, that is the aspect analogous to *Parashakti*. And it will be noticed that the latter aspect is more profoundly and more adequately than the former the latter to the supreme reality in its changelessness. That is why *Brahma* itself is *Parashaktiman* whereas *Pratirokta* only represents, in relation to manifestation, the *Shakti*, that is to say, the "productive Will" which is properly speaking the "Causal-power" (activity as regards the *Pratirokta*, becoming potency as regards the manifestation). It should be noted that when the conception is thus transcended beyond Being, it is no longer with "Images" and "Substances" that we are dealing, but rather with the *Ekanta* and *Pratirokta*, as we hope to explain on another occasion; it is also what the *Parashakti* tradition calls "Active Performance" (*Kriya*) and "Passive Realization" (*Pratirokta*) which moreover constitute a "Transition" to the absolute state.

² In Indian tradition also, *Śruti*, considered as an *Ātma* or a *cosmos* of all the aspects of Divinity (whose Realization is the "Divine realization"), is the ever-existing "matrix" of the *Viśvāṭma* with its constituent layers which suggests every creature that is universal thereby in it. What surface or *Śarīra* (body) takes in its highest sense, as the *Shakti* of *Brahma*? That is to say the "Manifestation" of the Supreme Principle. Again in an equally similar way, in the Jewish teaching, *Adam* (the first of the two *Adamim*) is the "garment" of *Ala-El* (the *Adonai* or the *Shekhina*).

UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF"

Diverse changes (of condition and modes of existence) are presented to the same (individual) soul while decaying (and in this state perceiving internal objects which belong to the domain of subtle manifestation)¹; divers illusory forms (corresponding to different modalities of formal manifestation, other than the corporeal modality) are assumed by this same subtle being without in any respect altering its unity (such illusory forms, *vyākṛti-rūpa*, being considered as purely accidental and not belonging, of themselves, to the being who assumes them, so that the latter must be regarded as unaffected by this merely apparent modification).² *Ādama* is almighty (since it contains all things in principle), capable of every activity (although "actionless," or rather on that very account,) without organ or instrument of action of any sort; therefore no motive or special end (such as pertains to an individual *āt*) other than its own will (which is indistinguishable from its omnipotence),³ must be assigned to the determination of the Universe. No accidental differentiation must be imputed to it (as in the case of a particular cause), because each individual being is modified (while developing its possibilities) in conformity with its own nature⁴; thus

¹ The modalities presented in a dream offer one of the most striking analogies that it is possible to put forward as illustrations of the multiplicity of the states of the being; we shall therefore have occasion to speak of it again if, as we intend, we one day set forth this metaphysical theory more completely.

² *Ādama* turned out this project in *Le Dieu Multiple de l'Ājā*, which is to be published in the present series of translations—(Translator).

³ In connection with this point an interesting comparison can be made with the teaching of Catholic theologians, and especially of St. Thomas Aquinas, on the subject of the forms that appear not only to assume. The similarity in all the most representative is that the points of view are naturally very different. We will therefore recall in passing what we have already had occasion to point out elsewhere, namely that almost everything that is said metaphorically of the *ātmā* can also be said metaphysically of the higher states of the being.

⁴ It is the *Śākti* which we have spoken of as potency (activity, and it is also *Śākti* as far as it is manifested in Universal Possibility; moreover, in itself, the *Śākti* can only be in regard to the *Viśvāpti* and if it is the manifested form the *Viśvāpti* no other, to be "separately" considered, it is then nothing but the "Great Illusion" (*Māyāśakti*), that is to say *Śākti* in its infinite and continuously changing state.

⁵ This is precisely the *śākti* of *śakti*, conceived as "activity" in the essential nature of being, applied to the entire order of universal phenomena.

UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF"

the rain-cloud distributes rain with impartiality (without regard to the special results which arise from secondary circumstances), and this same fertilizing rain causes different seeds to grow in various ways, producing a variety of plants according to their species (by reason of the different potentialities proper to these seeds respectively).¹ Every attribute of a first cause is (in principle) in *Brâhma*, which (in itself) is nevertheless devoid of every (definite) quality."²

"That which was, that which is and that which will be, truly all is *Omâtra* (the Universe principally identified with *Brâhma*, and, as such, symbolized by the sacred monosyllable *Om*); and all else which is not subjected to threefold time (*trika*, that is, the temporal condition viewed under its three modalities of past, present and future) is also truly *Omâtra*. Assuredly this *Âtma* (of which all things are but the manifestation) is *Brâhma*, and this *Âtma* (relatively to the various states of the being) has four conditions (*stâva*, a word signifying literally "feet"); in truth, all this is *Brâhma*."³

"All this," (is moreover the continuation of this latter text, which we shall give later on, clearly shows), must be understood as referring to the different modalities of the

¹ "O *Prâjapâti*! Those who bestowed on all beings that which befits them. Those have never declined to be called *aprajâti*. Those whose begotten extend to all times. Those have never declined to be called *akâra*. Those who were before the beginning, and who did not cease to be called *vevâdita*. Those who steadily took upholding the Universe, producing all its forms, without declining to be called *upâdâta*, it is in *Time* that I move" (*Chândogya* chapter VI; Father Wigger's French translation, page 262).

² "It can be said of the *Prâjapâti* only that it is the origin of everything and that it influences all while remaining indifferent." (*op. Cit.* chapter XXII, last, page 282).

³ The *Prâjapâti*, indifferent, impartial, has all things follow their course without influencing them. It claims no title (as qualification or attribution whatsoever). It will not. Doing nothing, there is nothing it does not do" (*op. Cit.* chapter XXV, last, page 292).

⁴ *Brâhma*-*Âtma* *Adhyâta* II, *Pañc* I, *stâva* 13 to 20. *Op. Cit.* page 26. IX, 2 to 7. "It is I, devoid of every sensible form, who have developed all the Universe. . . . Manifested in my productive power (*krâti*, who does is called *Prâkâti* because it is considered in relation to manifestation), I produce and reproduce (throughout all the spheres) the multitude of beings, without a determination, and by the sole virtue of that productive power."

⁵ *Yajurvéda* *Symbole*, *stâva* 1 and 2.

UNITY AND IDENTITY OF THE "SELF"

Individual being regarded in its integrality, as well as to the non-individual status of the total being, that is what is meant here by the conditions of *Amal* although, in itself, *Amal* is truly unconditional and never ceases to be so.

CHAPTER XI

THE DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF ĀTMA IN THE HUMAN BEING

We will now enter upon a more detailed study of the different conditions of the individual being, residing in the living form, which, as previously explained, includes the subtle form (*subtle-materialia* or *linga-sharīra*) on the one hand and the gross or bodily form (*stūla-sharīra*) on the other. The conditions we are referring to must not be confused with that particular condition which we have already noted as being special to each individual, distinguishing him from all other individuals, nor are they connected with that aggregate of limiting conditions defining each state of existence taken separately; in this instance we are referring exclusively to the various states or, if it be preferred, the various modalities to which, in a perfectly general way, any single individual being is subject, whatever the nature of that being may be. These modalities taken as a whole, can always be related both to the gross and to the subtle state, the former being confined to the bodily modality and the latter comprising the remainder of the individuality (there is no question here of the other individual states, since it is the human state in particular that we are considering). What is beyond these two states no longer belongs to the individual as such; we are referring to what may be called the "causal" state, that is to say the state which corresponds to *kāraṇa-sharīra* and which belongs consequently to the universal and formless order. With this causal state moreover, though, we are no longer in the realm of individual existence, we are still in the realm of Being; therefore, it is necessary in addition to *saṃsāra*, beyond Being, a fourth, absolutely unconditioned, principal

THE DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF ĀTMA

state. Metaphysically all these states, even those which belong strictly to the individual, are related to *Ātma*, that is to say to the Personality, since it is this alone which constitutes the fundamental reality of the being and since every state of that being would be purely illusory if one attempted to separate it from *Ātma*. The being's different states, whatever their nature, represent nothing but possibilities of *Ātma*; that is why it is possible to speak of the various conditions in which the being finds itself as in the various sense conditions of *Ātma*, although it must be clearly understood that *Ātma*, in itself, is in no way affected thereby and does not on that account cease to be unconditioned, in the same way that it never becomes manifested, although it is the essential and transcendent principle of manifestation in all its modes.

Disregarding for the moment the fourth state, to which we shall return later, the first three states are : the waking state, corresponding to gross manifestation; the dream state, corresponding to subtle manifestation; and deep sleep, which is the "causal" and formless state. Besides these three states another is sometimes mentioned, that of death, and even a further one, the state of ecstatic trance, considered as intermediate (*madhyam*)¹ between deep sleep and death, in the same way that dreaming is intermediate between waking and deep sleep.² These two last states however are not generally reckoned as separate since they are not essentially distinct from that of deep sleep, which is really an extra-individual state, as we have just explained, and in which the being returns likewise into non-manifestation, or at least into the formless, "the living soul (*jīva*) withdrawing into the bosom of the Universal Spirit (*Ātma*) along the path which leads to the very centre of the being," where is the seat of Brahman."³

¹ The word *madhyam* (derived from *madha*, the guest of Lakṣmi or of Jaganmūha) means literally in this word, in a more ordinary sense, to denote the twilight (morning and evening) similarly considered as intermediate between day and night, in the theory of cosmic cycles it signifies the interval between two Yugas.

² Concerning this state see *Brahma-Sūtra*, *Sūtras* III, *Pratya* 2, -*śloka* 20

³ *Brahma-Sūtra*, *Sūtras* III, *Pratya* 2, *śloka* 7 and 8

THE DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF ÂTMA

For the detailed description of these states we have only to turn to the text of the *Māndūkya Upaniṣad*, the opening passage of which we have already cited with the exception of one phrase, however, the first of all, which runs: "Om, this syllable (*akṣara*)¹ is everything that is its explanation follows." The sacred monosyllable *Om*, which represents the essence of the *Pada*,² is here taken as the ideographic symbol of *Âtma*. This syllable, composed of three letters (*akṣara*), these letters being *a*, *u* and *m*, the first two contracting into *e*,³ has four elements, the fourth of which, being none other than the monosyllable itself regarded synthetically under its principal aspect, is "non-expressed" by any letter (*anvaya*), being prior to all distinction in the "indivisible" (*akṣara*), similarly *Âtma* has four conditions (*avasthā*), the fourth of which is not really a special condition at all but is *Âtma* regarded in itself, in an absolutely transcendent manner independently of any condition and which, as such, is not susceptible of any representation. We will now go on to explain what the text we referred to says on the subject of each of these conditions of *Âtma*, starting from the last degree, that of manifestation, and working back to the supreme, total and unconditioned state.

¹ The word *Âkṣara* etymologically means "indivisible" or "not destructible". If the syllable mentioned is by means of this word, this indicates the syllable (*pad*) and not the alphabetical letter) is based upon an contracting the primitive root and fundamental element of language. Moreover every verbal root is syllable. A verbal root in Sanskrit consists always, a word properly meaning "word" because, through the possibility of multiple modifications that it carries and contains in itself, it is indeed the root which, by its development, gives birth to the entire language. It may be said that this root is the fixed and final element in a word, representing an fundamental and established nature, to which secondary and variable elements come to be added, representing accidents (in the etymological sense) or modifications of the principal idea.

² Cf. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Prapāṭhikā I, Khanda 1, and Prapāṭhikā II, Khanda 13. also *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, Adhyāya 7, Brahman 5, 10 and 11.

³ In Sanskrit the vowel *e* is actually formed from the combination of *a* and *u*, just as the vowel *i* is formed from the union of *i* and *u*. Likewise *o*, *ā* and *ī*, the three vowels *a*, *i* and *u* are the only ones that are considered fundamental and really distinct.

THE WAKING STATE

conception is called upon to apply. It is in this sense that the state in question can be related to "Universal Man" and described as constituting his body, conceived by analogy with the body of individual man, an analogy which is that of the macrocosm (*makrokosmos*) and the microcosm (*mikrokosmos*), as we have already explained. Under this aspect *Psychokulture* is also identified with *Psyche*, that is to say with the cosmic intelligence in so far as it governs and unifies in its integrality the whole of the corporeal world. Finally, from another point of view, which however corroborates the preceding one, *Psychokulture* also means "that which is common to all men," (1) that case it is the human species, understood as specific nature, or more exactly what may be called "the genus of the species."² Furthermore it should be observed that the corporeal state is in fact common to all human individuals whatever may be the other modalities in which they are capable of developing themselves in order to realize, as individuals and without going beyond the the human level,³ the full range of their respective possibilities.

After what has just been said it will be easy for us to explain the significance of the seven members mentioned in the *Metaphysik Überwindet* and which form the seven princi-

¹ In this connection, now or no is man considered as an individual belonging to the human species, whereas what is more exactly man in his capacity as a thinking being, this is to say as a being understood with the moral faculty, which is measured the spiritual attributes inherent in his species and the one by which the nature of the species is characterized. On the other hand, the same Man is now the last capable of being developed ideologically (it is to be identified with *Psyche*), and thus it comes about that *Psyche* is sometimes referred to as *Microcosm* or "Supreme Man," a name which must not be taken as implying the last word of anthropomorphism, any more than the conception of "Universal Man" gives all its aspects, and that it thus pervades in virtue of the transposition. We cannot here undertake an investigation of the manifold and complex meanings implied in the word *man*; as for the nature of the species, a whole special study would be needed to deal adequately with the developments in which it may give rise.

² It would be interesting to establish points of correspondence with the conception of "nature" nature in the Greek and Roman traditions, a conception which differs in application at different levels and in more fundamentally important, but this would lead us too far afield and all the material we need find returns to the same subject.

THE WAKING STATE

and parts of the macrocosmic body of *Paśāṇasāra*. Taking them in order: (1) the assemblage of the higher luminous spheres, that is to say of the higher states of being (considered however in this instance solely in their relationship with the particular state in question), is compared with the part of the head containing the brain, for the brain in fact corresponds organically with the "mental" function, which is but a reflection of the intelligible Light or of the supra-individual principle; (2) the sun and the moon, or more exactly the principles represented in the sensible world by these two luminaries,¹ are the two eyes; (3) the igneous principle is the mouth²; (4) the directions of space (*diśa*) are the ears³; (5) the atmosphere, that is to say the cosmic environment whence the "vital breath" (*prāṇa*) proceeds, corresponds to the lungs; (6) the intermediate region (*śaravātā*), spreading between the Earth (*Bhū* or *Bhūmā*) and the luminous spheres or the Heavens (*Śveta* or *Śvarga*) and considered as the region where forms (*rūpa* potental) in relation to the gross state⁴ are elaborated, corresponds to the stomach⁵; (7) finally the Earth, that is to say, symbolically, the final term in actuation

¹ Here one might recall the symbolical meanings which the Sun and Moon bear in the Western Hermetic tradition and in the cosmological theories that the Alchemists based on it, in either case just the designation of these heavenly bodies to taken literally. It should also be observed that the present symbolism differs from that previously studied in, according to which the Sun and the Moon correspond respectively to the heart and the brain. Here again very explications would be necessary in order to show how these different points of view are reconciled and harmonized in the whole framework of analogical correspondences.

² We have already remarked that *Paśāṇasāra* is occasionally a state of Ajas, who is then chiefly considered as the agent of relaxing warmth. Therefore in the form in which he is dwelling in living beings, we shall have occasion to refer to this again at a later stage. Furthermore, *śaravātā* is both the mouth of the mouth (*mukha*) and the principal vital air (it is in the latter sense that the five *āyāsa* are its members), and *śaravātā* is intimately associated with the *ajās*.

³ One may notice the remarkable relationship between this symbolism and the physiological function of the semi-circular canals.

⁴ In our word, the word *śaravātā* also includes the atmosphere, which is then considered as the medium of diffusion of *ajās*; it is also worth noting that the agent of heat diffusion is not air (*vāta*) but Ether (*ākāśa*). When the term is employed in order to make them applicable to the anatomy of the states of universal manifestation, *śaravātā* is identified with *Śveta*, the middle layer of the *Trikāśa*, which is ordinarily described as the atmosphere, the word being taken however as a much more restricted

THE WAKING STATE

of the entire corporeal manifestation, corresponds to the feet, which are taken here as the emblem of the whole lower portion of the body. The relationship of these various members to one another and their functions in the cosmic whole to which they belong is analogous (but not identical, be it understood) with the relationship between the corresponding parts of the human organism. It will be noticed that no mention is made here of the heart, because its direct relationship with universal Intelligence places it outside the sphere of the individual functions properly so called, and because this "seat of *Brâhma*" is really and truly the central point both in the cosmic and in the human orders, whereas everything pertaining to manifestation, and above all to formal manifestation, is external and "peripheral," if one may so express it, belonging exclusively to the circumference of the "wheel of things."

In the condition we are describing, *Atma*, as *Parashakti*, becomes conscious of the world of sensible manifestation (considered also as the sphere of that aspect of the "cosmic-supreme" *Brâhma* which is called *Prâg*). It does so by means of nineteen organs, which are described as so many mouths, because they are the "entrance-ways" of knowledge for everything belonging to this particular domain: moreover the intellectual assimilation which operates on knowledge is often compared symbolically with the vital assimilation effected by nutrition. These nineteen organs (also including in that term the corresponding faculties, in accordance with our previous explanation of the general significance of the word *indriya*) are: the five organs of sensation, the five organs of action, the five vital breaths (*prâṇa*), the "mental" faculty or the inward sense (*manas*),

and last determinate wave than in the preceding one. The names of the three worlds, *Ita*, *Abhya* and *Ata*, are the three syllables, *avah*, which are usually offered after the conventional *Om* as the Hindu rites of *Samâdhya* (which is meditation repeated in the morning, at mid-day and in the evening). It is noticeable that the first two of the three names derive from the same root, because they refer to conditions of the same kind of existence, namely that of human individuality, while the third represents, as the *drâgha*, the whole of the higher states.

THE WAKING STATE

the intellect (*Buddhi*, considered here exclusively in its relation to the individual state), thought (*Manas*), conceived as the faculty which gives form to ideas and which integrates them one with another, and finally individual consciousness (*Akashita*): these are the faculties which we have already studied in detail. Each organ and each faculty of every individual belonging to the domain in question, that is to say to the corporeal world, proceeds respectively from its corresponding organ or faculty in *Feishichakana*; of this organ and faculty it is in a certain sense one of the constituent elements, in the same way that the individual to which it belongs is an element of the cosmic whole, in which, for its part and in the place allotted to it (from the fact that it is that individual being and not another), it contributes of necessity towards making up the total harmony.¹

The waking state, in which the activity of the organs and faculties in question is exercised, is described as the first of the conditions of *Jagat*, although the gross or corporeal modality to which it corresponds occupies the lowest degree in the order of development (*prapancha*) of manifestation, starting from its primordial and unmanifested principle; it marks indeed the first of that development, at least in relation to the state of existence in which human individuality is situated. The reason for this apparent anomaly has already been explained: it is in this corporeal modality that we find the basis and point of departure, firstly of individual realisation (that is to say of the full realisation of the individuality in its integral extension), and afterwards of all further realisation which has beyond the individual possibilities and implies the taking possession by the being of its higher states. Consequently if, instead of placing oneself at the point of view of the development of manifestation, one places oneself, as we are doing at present, at the point of view

¹ This harmony is also an aspect of *Dharma*—it is the equilibrium in which all developments are co-ordinated, the order which is made up of the sum of all partial and separate *dharmas*.

THE WAKING STATE

of this realization with its various degrees, the order of which necessarily proceeds in the contrary direction, from the manifested to the unmanifested, then in that case the waking state must clearly be looked upon as in fact preceding the states of dreaming and deep sleep, which correspond respectively to the extra-corporeal modalities of the individuality and to the supra-individual states of the being.

CHAPTER XIII

THE DREAM STATE OR THE CONDITION OF TAIJIAN

The second condition is *Taijien* (the "Luminous," a word derived from *Tai*, the aqueous element), whose seat is in the dream state (*mu-shen-shih*), which has knowledge of inward (mental) objects, which has seven members and nineteen mouths and whose domain is the world of subtle manifestation.¹

In this state the outward faculties, while existing all the time potentially, are reabsorbed into the inward sense (*shen*), which is at the same time their common source, their support and their immediate end, and which resides in the luminous arteries (*shih*) of the subtle form, where it is distributed without any division of its nature in the manner of a diffused heat. The aqueous element, in itself, considered in its essential properties, is indeed it one and the same time light and heat; and, as the very name *Taijien* applied to the subtle state indicates, these two aspects, mutually transposed (since there is no longer any question here of sensible qualities) must be found in that state also. As we have already had occasion to remark elsewhere, everything belonging to the subtle state is very closely connected with the nature of life itself, which is inseparable from heat; and it may be recalled that on this point, as on many others, the conceptions of Aristotle are in complete agreement with those of the East. As to the luminosity to which we have just alluded, it

¹ *Shen-shih* (Spiritual Element) is the seat of the subtle state, which is called *mu-shen-shih*, literally "pre-ponderant." Because it is a state of definition that provides gross manifestation, the word also means "superior," because the "living soul," when in the dream state, is to all intents detached from itself, contrary to what happens in the waking state which is "attached to all men."

THE DREAM STATE

should be regarded as the reflection and defraction of the intelligible Light as the extra-sensible modalities of formal manifestation (among which however it is only necessary to the present instance to consider those relating to the human sense). Furthermore, the subtle form itself (*subtle-formative* or *deep-formative*) in which Teyar dwells is likened to a fiery vehicle,² although this must of course be distinguished from corporeal fire (the element *Tylo* or that which derives from it) which is perceived by the senses of the gross form (*white-formative*, vehicle of *Paakadarsa*, and more particularly by sight, since visibility, necessarily presupposing the presence of light, is the sensible quality naturally belonging to Teyar; in the subtle state however there can no longer be any question of *Hikar*, but only of the corresponding *samavai* which are their immediate determining principles).

As to the *adhi* or arteries belonging to the subtle form, they should on no account be confused with the corporeal arteries by means of which the circulation of the blood is effected; physiologically, they correspond rather to the ramifications of the nervous system, for they are expressly described as *humorous*; moreover, just as fire is in a sense polarized into heat and light, so the subtle state is linked to the corporeal state in two different and complementary ways, through the blood as to the caloric and through the nervous system as to the luminous quality.³ At the

² Literally in this connection we have recalled the "chariot of fire" upon which the prophet Elijah was taken up to heaven (II Kings vi, vi).

³ We have already mentioned, in discussing the composition of the *pranaparakas*, which is the bodily organism, that the elements of the nervous system originate from the stimulation of fiery substances. As for blood, being liquid, it is formed originally from vitreous substance, but these must have undergone an elaboration due to the action of the vital heat, which is the transformation of *agni Paakadarsa*, and they only play the part of a plastic support that serves for the fixation of an element of grosser nature. Fire and water have appeared, in relation to the blood.

"Humor" and "substance" is a relative term. One might easily compare this with certain alchemical theories such as those which attribute the principles called "sulfur" and "mercury" to the sun and the moon (see *Parvati*, which are respectively ascribed, in the order of "white" matter, to the sun and water on the order of elements) not to mention the many other designations that are confused symbolically, in the Hermetic language, in the two opposite poles of a duality of the nature

THE DREAM STATE

more time it must be clearly understood that between the *idhā* and the nerves there is correspondence only and not identification, since the former are not corporeal and we are really concerned with two different spheres within the integral individuality. Similarly, when a relationship is established between the functions of their *nāḍī* and respiration,¹ because respiration is essential for maintaining life and corresponds in a real way to the principal vital act, it should not be concluded on that account that they can be represented as canals of some sort in which the air circulates; this would amount to confusing the "vital breath" (*prāṇa*), which properly belongs to the order of subtle manifestation, with a bodily function.² It is said that the total number of *idhā* is seventy-two thousand; according to other texts however it would appear to be seven hundred and twenty millions, but the difference here is more apparent than real, since these numbers are meant to be taken symbolically and not literally, as is usual in such cases; and this will be apparent if one observes their obvious connection with the cyclic numbers.³ Further on we shall have occasion to supplement our remarks upon the subject of the subtle arteries as well as on the different stages in the process of reabsorption of

¹ We are alluding here more especially to the teachings connected with *Yoga-Yajna*, that is to say to the methods preparatory to "Union" (*Yoga*) to the proper state of the world, which are based on the consideration of certain vibrations, closely bound up with breath-control. That the Chinese masters who have still able to discern many of the same functions, and often indeed the actual proceedings connected to an *idhā* similar to both traditions, is fact however which is not to be taken as evidence of any borrowing. The science of medicine, in fact, may well be known in two different quarters quite independently, for we are dealing here with a science having its own definite subject and corresponding to a clearly defined order of reality, although this order is quite unknown to Westerners.

² This confusion has actually been perpetrated by certain occultists, whose understanding is decidedly apter to operate outside the limits of the corporeal world.

³ The fundamental cyclic numbers are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000. These are the most immediate and elementary applications, but we cannot enter now into the proper spiritual applications that arise out of the transposition of these data into different orders.

THE DREAM STATE

the individual faculties: as we have said, this reabsorption is effected in an order inverse to the development of those same faculties.

In the dream state the individual "living soul" (*jīvaśat*) "is to itself its own light" and it produces, through the action of its own desire (*kāma*) alone, a world issuing squarely from itself, in which the objects consist exclusively of mental conceptions, that is to say of combinations of ideas clothed in subtle forms, depending substantially upon the subtle form of the individual himself, of which they are merely so many secondary and accidental modifications.¹

There is however always something incomplete and unco-ordinated about this production: it is for this reason that it is looked upon as illusory (*māyā*) or as only possessing an apparent (*pratyakṣa*) existence; whereas, in the sensible world where it is situated in the waking state, the same "living soul" possesses the faculty of acting in the sense of a practical (*vaiśvānara*) production, also illusory no doubt with regard to absolute (*paramārśa*) reality and transitory like all manifestation, yet nevertheless possessing a relative reality and a stability sufficient for the needs of ordinary "profane" life (*laukika*, a word derived from *loka*, the "world," which should here be taken in a sense exactly equivalent to that which it normally bears in the Gospels). However it is important to observe that this difference respecting the orientation of the activity of the being in the two states does not imply an effective superiority of the waking state over the dream state when each is considered in itself; at least a superiority which is valid only from a "profane" point of view cannot metaphysically be considered as a real superiority; and indeed from another point of view the possibilities of the dream state are more extensive than those of the waking state and they allow the individual to escape to a certain measure from some of the limiting

¹ Cf. *Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya* (commented, *śāṅkara*, VI, *Bibliotheca* 2, Paris 2 and 3).

THE DREAM STATE

conditions to which he is subject in the corporeal modality.¹ But, however that may be, the absolutely real (*paranirvāṇa*) is the Self (*Ātma*) alone; it is utterly unattainable by any conception that confines itself to the consideration of external and internal objects, knowledge of which constitutes respectively the waking and dream states; certain heterodox schools, which did in fact restrict their attention in this way to the aggregate of these two states, thereby condemned themselves to remain wholly enclosed within the limits of formal manifestation and the human individuality.

By reason of its connection with the mental faculty the realm of subtle manifestation can be described as an ideal world, to distinguish it from the sensible world which is the realm of gross manifestation. This term however should not be taken in the sense of Plato's "intelligible world," since his "ideas" are possibilities in the principal state, which must be referred to formless being (in spite of the over-imaginative expressions in which Plato often enveloped his thoughts) : in the subtle state we are still only concerned with ideas clothed in forms, since the possibilities which this state comprises do not extend beyond individual existence.² Above all it is important not to be misled into imagining an opposition here of the kind which causes modern philosophers chafe to establish between "ideal" and "real"; such an opposition is really quite meaningless. Everything that is, under whatever mode it may happen to exist, is real for that very reason and possesses precisely the type and degree of reality consonant with its own nature, something consisting in ideas (and that is all the meaning properly attributable to the word "ideal") is neither more nor less real on that account than something consisting in anything else, each possibility necessarily finding its position at that

¹ On the dream state cf. *Śaṅkara-bhāṣya*, *Advaita* III, Page 2, verse 1 to 3.

² The subtle state is properly the realm of *śūnya* and not that of *saṃjā*; the latter in reality corresponds to *Buddhi*, that of the day to *Manas* or *intellect* (as translated).

THE DREAM STATE

level in the universal hierarchy determined for it by its own nature.

In the order of universal manifestation, just as the sensible world, in its entirety, is identified with *Form*, so the ideal world of which we have been speaking is identified with *Hiranyagarbha* (literally, the "Golden Embryo"), which is *Brahmā* (determination of *Brahma* as effect, *bhava*),¹ developing Himself in the "World Egg" (*Brāhmandā*),² out of which there will develop, according to its mode of realization, the whole formal manifestation which is contained therein virtually as a conception of the *Hiranyagarbha*, primordial germ of the cosmic Light.³ Furthermore *Hiranyagarbha* is described as the "synthetic aggregate of life" (*Prag-jñāna*)⁴; indeed it can really be identified with "Universal Life,"⁵ by reason of the previously mentioned connection between the subtle state and life, which, even when considered in its entire extension (and not limited to organic or corporeal life only, to which

¹ This name bears a meaning very close to that of *Parjany*, for gold, according to the Hindu doctrine, is the "material light". The alchemists also looked on it as corresponding by analogy, among the metals, to the sun among the planets; and it is at least a reminiscence that the Latin name for gold (*aurum*) is strikingly similar to the Hebrew *or*, which means "light".

² It must be pointed out that *Brahmā* is a masculine term, while *Brahma* is neuter. The indissoluble distinction, which is of the highest importance (plane of expression. The distinction of the "Supreme" from the "not Supreme") cannot be indicated if, as is usual among orientalists, one employs the single form of *Brahman* which belongs to neither gender. The latter practice leads to perpetual confusion, especially in a language like French where the noun gender is wanting.

³ This cosmogonic symbol of the "World-Egg" is in no way peculiar to India. It is for example to be found in Mesopotamia, as the Egyptian tradition (the Egg of *Isis*), or that of the Druids and as the Gnostic tradition. The esoterician conception which is such individual being plays a corresponding part to that played by *Brāhmandā* in the cosmic order, i.e. as *Brahmā* called *Form*, and the identity between the "macrocosm" and the "microcosm," considered under this aspect, is expressed in the following formula: *Yajñe pūrāṇa* said *Brāhmandā*, "as the individual embryo, so the World-Egg."

⁴ That is why *Prag* proceeds from *Hiranyagarbha*, and *Jñāna* is *Form*, proceeds from *Form*.

⁵ The word *prāṇa* signifies properly a breath, and thence a concept and undifferentiated mass.

⁶ "And the life was the light of men." (*Gen.* ¹3, ²4)

THE DREAM STATE

fold the physiological point of view is restricted),¹ is nevertheless but one of the special conditions of the state of existence to which human individuality belongs. The sphere of life therefore does not extend beyond the possibilities comprised within that state, which, be it understood, should here be viewed integrally and taken as including the subtle modalities as well as the gross modality.

Whether one places oneself at the "macrocosmic" point of view, as we have just done, or at the "microcosmic" point of view which we adopted to begin with, the ideal world in question is conceived by faculties corresponding analogically to those by which the sensible world is perceived, or if it be preferred, which are the same faculties as those in principle (since they are still individual faculties), but considered under another mode of existence and at another degree of development, their activity being carried in a different realm. This explains how *banda* in this dream state, that is to say under the aspect of *Tajasa*, comes to have the same number of members and modes (or instruments of knowledge) as in the waking state under the aspect of *Prakritadarsa*.²

There is no necessity to enumerate them a second time since the definitions we have already given can be applied equally, by means of a suitable transposition, to the two realms of gross or sensible manifestation and subtle or ideal manifestation.

¹ We are especially alluding to the statement of two sūtras in our text which is adopted in the pages of note of the Western edition, and which in fact alludes to possibilities contained in a postulation of human individuality: as we have explained elsewhere, this is what the Purāṇic verse indicates when it says the name of "imagery."

² These faculties must here be regarded as distributed in the three "vehicles," which by their combination constitute the subtle form (sukshma-rūpa), manomaya-rūpa and jñānamaya-rūpa.

CHAPTER XIV

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP OR THE CONDITION OF *Pañjra*.

"When the being who is asleep experiences no desire and is not the subject of any dream, his state is that of deep sleep (*mahepaushāra*): he (that is to say *Ātma* itself in this condition) who in this state has become one (without any distinction or differentiation),¹ who has identified himself with a synthetic whole (unique and without particular determination) of integral Knowledge (*Pratyak-gīṣa*),² who is filled (by innocent penetration and assimilation) with Brahmada (*brahmadāya*), actually enjoying that Brahmada (*Ānanda*, as his own ruler) and whose mouth (the instrument of knowledge) is (archaically) food Consciousness (*Chet*) itself (without intermediary or particularisation of any sort), that one is called *Pañjra* (He who knows above and beyond any special condition); that is the third condition."³

As will at once be apparent, the vehicle of *Ātma* in this state is the *āhara-śarīra*, since this is *brahmadāya-śarīra*; and although it is spoken of analogically as a vehicle or an envelope, it is not really something distinct from *Ātma* itself, since here we are beyond the sphere of distinction. Brahmada is made up of all the possibilities of *Ātma*; it is, one might say, the sum itself of these

¹ Tansen Mahepa declares, "At a time, during sleep the uncontracted soul is absorbed into the whole, at the waking state, being detached, it distinguishes diverse things" (*Chang-tse chapter II*, French translation by Hsiao Wang, page 102).

² "To comprehend all this intellectual activity as it were in one mass" is another expression of the *Pañjra*-*śarīra* bearing the other meaning (*Chang-tse chapter II*, Hsiao Wang's translation, page 102). *Pratyak* or integral Knowledge, a term opposed to *vikalpa* or *delusory* knowledge, which *Pañjra* operates upon, is the individual or limited state, characterised (the two principles, *Chet* and *svadharma-dāya* in the first of the "Gāyatri") in which *Ātma* is clothed on entering the "world of names and forms," that is to say when manifesting itself as *prajñā*.

³ *Mahepa's Epiphany*, verse 3.

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP

possibilities, and if *Atma*, as *Prajna*, enjoys this *Śaśvata* as its rightful kingdom, that is because it is really nothing else than the plenitude of its being, as we have already pointed out. This is essentially a formless and vapour-individual state; it cannot therefore have anything to do with a "psychic" or "psychological" state, as certain orientales have supposed. The psychic properly speaking is in fact the subtle state; and in making this assimilation we take the word "psychic" in its primitive sense, as used by the ancients, without concerning ourselves with the various far more specialized meanings which have been attached to it in later times, whereby it almost be made to apply even to the whole of the subtle state. As for modern Western psychology, it deals only with quite a restricted portion of the human individuality, where the mental faculty is in direct relationship with the corporeal modality, and, given the methods it employs, it is incapable of going any further. In any case the very objective which it sets before itself and which is exclusively the study of mental phenomena, limits it strictly to the realm of the individuality, so that the state which we are now discussing necessarily eludes its investigations. Indeed it might even be said that this state is doubly inaccessible to it, in the first place because it lies beyond the mental sphere or the sphere of discursive and differentiated thought, and in the second place because it lies equally beyond all phenomena of any kind, that is to say beyond all formal manifestation.

This state of undifferentiation, in which all knowledge, including that of the other states, is synthetically centralized in the eternal and fundamental unity of the being, is the unmanifested and "non-developed" (*avyakṛt*) state, principle and cause (*kāraṇa*) of all manifestation and the space from which manifestation is developed is the multiplicity of its different states and more particularly, as concerns the human being, in its subtle and gross states. This unmanifested state, conceived as root of the manifested (*vyakṛta*), which is only its effect (*kārya*),

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP

is identified in this respect with *Mula-Prakriti*, "Primalordial Nature": but in reality it is *Parakriti* as well as *Prakriti*, centring them both in its own undifferentiation, for it is cause in the complete sense of the word, that is to say both at one and the same time "efficient cause" and "material cause," to use the ordinary terminology, to which however we much prefer the expressions "essential cause" and "substantial cause," since these two complementary aspects of causality do in fact relate respectively to "essence" and to "substance," in the sense we have previously given to these words. If *Atma*, in this third state, is thus beyond the distinction of *Parakriti* and *Prakriti*, or of the two poles of manifestation, that is simply because it is no longer situated within conditioned existence, but actually at the level of pure Being; nevertheless *Parakriti* and *Prakriti*, which are themselves still unmanifested, should be included within it and this is even in secret truth, as we shall see later on, of the formless states of manifestation as well, which it has already been necessary to attach to the Universal, since they are really supra-individual states of the being; moreover it has to be remembered that all manifested states are contained, synthetically and in principle, within unmanifested Being.

In this state the different objects of manifestation, including those of individual manifestation, external as well as internal, are not destroyed, but submit in principal mode, being unified by the very fact that they are no longer involved under the secondary or contingent aspect of distinction, of necessity they find themselves among the possibilities of the Self and the latter remains conscious in itself of all these possibilities, as "non-discriminately" beheld in integral Knowledge, from the very fact of being conscious of its own permanence in the "eternal present."¹

¹ It is this which allows of the transposition in a metaphysical sense of the theological doctrine of the "resurrection of the dead," as well as the conception of "the physical body" (the latter, moreover, is not a body in the proper sense of the word, but its "transformation" [or "transfiguration"] that is to say its transposition outside form and the other conditions of individual existence) or other words it is the "induration" of the permanent and immovable possibility of which "the body" is but a transient expression in conditioned mode.

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP

Were it otherwise and were the objects of manifestation not that to subsist principally (a supposition impossible in itself, however, because these objects would then be but a pure nothing, which could not exist at all, not even in illusory mode) there could be no return from the state of deep sleep to the state of dreaming and waking, since all formal manifestation would be irremediably destroyed for the being once it had entered deep sleep, but such a return is on the contrary always possible and does in fact take place, at least for the being who is not actually "delivered," that is to say definitely freed from the conditions of individual existence.

The term *Chit*, unlike its previously mentioned derivative *Chete*, must not be understood in the restricted sense of individual and formal thought (this restrictive determination, which implies a modification by reflection, being marked in the derivatives by the suffix *das*, which is the termination of the passive participle) but in the universal sense, as the total Consciousness of the "Self" looked at in its relationship with its unique object, which is *Ananda* or *Beatitude*.¹ This object, while constituting in a certain sense an envelope of the "Self" (*Ananda-maya-hula*), as we have already explained, is identical with the subject itself, which is *Sat* or pure Being and is not really distinct from it, as indeed it could not be, once there is no longer any real distinction.² Thus these

¹ The state of deep sleep has been described as "unconscious" by certain philosophers who even went so far as to identify it with the "Unbewusstsein" of German philosophers like Hartmann, who never dispute with them the fact that they are unable to conceive of any consciousness other than individual and "psychological" consciousness. But their opinion appears more the less unreasonable, for it is not easy to see how, with such an idea of *Chit*, they are able to understand such terms as *Chit*, *Pratyaksha* and *Proksha*.

² The terms "subject" and "object," in the sense in which they are used here, cannot lead to any ambiguity: the subject is "the person," the object is "the known" and their relation is immediately real. Nevertheless, in modern philosophy the sense of these terms and especially of their derivatives "subjective" and "objective" has called for such a push that they have been given almost diametrically opposed interpretations, and now, philosophers have taken these misunderstandings to indicate negatively conflicting meanings, despite their use which gives rise to considerable disagreement from the point of view of clarity, and generally speaking it is advisable to avoid them as far as possible.

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP

these, *Ist*, *Chit* and *Ananda* (generally united in *Ishti-ananda*)¹ are but one single and identical entity, and this "one" is *Atma*, considered outside and beyond all the particular conditions which determine each of its various states of manifestation.

In this state, which is also sometimes called by the name of *avapadeśa* or "ascendancy," the intelligible Light is perceived directly, that is to say by intellectual intuition, and no longer by reflection through the mental faculty (*manas*) as occurs in the individual states. We have previously applied this expression "intellectual intuition" to *Buddhi*, faculty of supra-rational and supra-individual knowledge, although already manifested: in this respect therefore *Buddhi* must in a way be included in the state of *Pratyak*, which thus will comprise everything which is beyond individual existence. We have therefore to consider a new ternary group as Being constituted by *Paraśa*, *Pratyak* and *Buddhi*, that is to say by the two points of manifestation, "essence" and "substance," and by the first production of *Pratyak* under the influence of *Paraśa*, this production being foretime manifestation. Moreover it must be added that this ternary group only represents what might be called the "outwardness" of Being and does not therefore coincide in any way with the other principal group we have just described and which refers really to its "inwardness"; it would amount rather to a first particularisation of Being in distinctive mode.² It goes without saying of course that in speaking

¹ In Sanskrit we have, as equivalents of these three terms, *Intelligence* (*Bh-śakti*), the *Intelligent* (*Bh-śakti*) and the *Intelligible* (*Bh-śakti*); the first is obviously Complement (*Chit*), the second is the subject (*Chit*) and the third is the object (*Ananda*), the three being but one in Being. * which means Truth by itself.

² *Pratibhāṣanā* (Pratibhāṣa, *śābhyā* IV, *Śrīmadbhāṣa* 2, *Śrīmad* 12, up. *Śrīmadbhāṣa*, *śābhyā* I, *Pratibhā* 2, *Śrīmad* 2. See also our comments on the meaning of the word *Pratyak* which will appear in a later chapter.

³ It might be said, bearing in mind the conventions that we have just concerning the use of these words, that *Paraśa* is the "substantial" point of *Intelligence* and *Pratyak* the "essential" point. *Buddhi* then naturally corresponds to *Knowledge*, which is so it would be a confusion of the subject and object or thus "confusion etc." to use the language of mystics. However it is important to note that in the order of Universal Existence it is

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP

here of outward and inward, we are using a purely ontological language, based upon a special symbolism and which could not apply literally to pure Being. Furthermore the ternary group *Sachchidānanda*, which is co-extensive with Being, is transposed again, in the order of foretime manifestation, into the ternary group distinguishable in *Buddhi* of which we have already spoken: the *Manya-Partha* which we then quoted, declares that "in the Universal, *Mohar* (or *Buddhi*) is *Jidamara*", and *Pragna* is also *Jidamara*, to Whom the *idamara-chakra* properly belongs. It can also be said that the *Tremura* or "triple manifestation" is only the "outwardness" of *Jidamara*: in Himself the latter is independent of all manifestation, of which He is the principle, since He is Being itself: and everything that is said of *Jidamara*, as well in Himself as in relation to manifestations, can be said equally of *Pragna* which is identified with Him. Thus, apart from the special viewpoint of manifestation and of the various conditioned states which depend upon it within that manifestation, the intellect is not different from *Jidam*, since the latter must be considered as "knowing itself by itself," for there is then no longer any entity which is really distinct from it, everything being comprised within its own possibilities, and it is in that "Knowledge of the Self" that Beatitude strictly speaking resides.

"The one (*Pragna*) is the Lord (*Jidamara*) of all (jatas, a term which here implies, in its universal extension, the aggregate of the "three worlds," that is to say of all the states of manifestation comprised synthetically in their principle); He is omnipresent (since all is present to Him

Footnote: This "conscious" has propounded under the "reflexion" influence of *Pravara* subjects to the order of individual sentences, on the contrary it is the subject that knows under the action of the object. The analysis is therefore reversed in this case to in those we have previously mentioned. Lastly, if intelligence be taken as subject in the subject (although its "manifest" possesses the position of one complementary subject) and will be obliged to say that the universal intellect is essentially active, while the individual intelligence is passive at least relatively suggests though it be also active at the same time in another respect, and still a subject or subject by its "reflexion" character which again is fully in agreement with *Levy's* - theories.

THE STATE OF DEEP SLEEP

is integral knowledge and He knows directly all effects in the principal total cause, which is in no way distinct from Him¹; He is the inward governor (*amaraṭa*), who, residing at the very centre of the being, regulates and controls all the faculties corresponding to the being's various states, while Himself continuing "actionless" in the fulness of His principal activity². He is the source (*jan*, matrix or primordial root, at the same time as principle or first cause) of all (that exists under any mode whatever); He is the origin (*pradhātā*, by His expansion as the indefinite multitude of His possibilities) and the end (*apyaṇa*, by His return into the unity of Himself)³ of the universality of beings (being Himself Universal Being).⁴

¹ *Īhara* means "intimately" in these texts, as has been said by the Indian philosophers, and they are therefore constituents of its nature, with nothing can be found in the effects that was not in its found in the cause first of all. When the first cause, meaning soul, knows all effects by that very fact that in its way it knows all things, it is an absolutely direct and "unobscured" matter.

² This "inward governor" is identical with the "Universal Father" referred to in the *Upanishads* and quoted in an earlier note. The *Āstika* tradition also says that "the sovereignty of Heaven is actionless", according to its terminology. Heaven (*Īra*) corresponds to Puruṣa (personified in the various levels that we have already indicated) and Earth (*Ṭā*) to Prakṛti, about which the *Śāṅkhya* are emphatic in the same sense that they stress here or elsewhere attributes of the Hindu Tradition.

³ In the ancient order this can be applied to the two phases of "expansion" and "retraction" referring to aspects of each cycle taken separately; but here it is the totality of cycles or cycles constituting universal self-renewal that is referred to.

⁴ *Ānandabala* (commentary), *Śloka* 4.

CHAPTER XV

THE UNCONDITIONED STATE OF *Ātma*

"Waking, dreaming, deep sleep and that which is beyond, such are the four states of *Ātma* : the greatest (*mahatma*) is the Fourth (*Turiya*). In the first three *Brahma* dwells with one of its feet ; it has three feet in the last."¹ Thus, the proportions previously established from one point of view are found reversed from another point of view : of the four feet (*padas*) of *Ātma*, the first three, when the states of *Ātma* are considered distinctively, only have the importance of one from the metaphysical viewpoint, and from that same viewpoint the last is three in itself. If *Brahma* were not "without parts" (*abheda*) it might be said that only a quarter of it is in Being (including therewith universal manifestation of which it is the principle) while its three other quarters are outside Being.² These three other quarters may be regarded in the following manner: (1) the totality of the possibilities of manifestation in so far as they are not manifested, subsisting therefore in an absolutely permanent and unconditioned state, like everything belonging to the "Fourth" (in so far as they are manifested they belong to the first two states: as manifestable they belong to the third state, principal in relation to the two former); (2) the totality of the possibilities of non-manifestation (of which moreover we only speak in the place by analogy, for they are evidently beyond multiplicity and even beyond unity); (3) lastly, the Supreme Principle of both, which is Universal Possibility, total, infinite and absolute.³

¹ *Ātma Sphoṭanāt, Prapñcika* 3, śloka 11.

² *Padas*, which means foot, can also mean "quarter."

³ Finally, when considering the first three states, which together constitute the realm of Being, it should also be said that the first two amount to as much (that is, third of Being, since they only contain formal manifestation), while the third state by itself amounts to two-thirds, since it includes both formal manifestation and unmanifested Being. It is essential to note that only possibilities of manifestation enter into the realm of Being, even when considered in all its universality.

THE UNCONDITIONED STATE OF ĀTMĀ

"The Sages think that the "Fourth" (*Chaturthā*),¹ which knows neither internal nor external objects (as a distinctive or analytical sense), nor the former and the latter taken together (regarded synthetically and in principle) and which is not (even) a synthetic whole of integral knowledge, being neither knowing nor not knowing, is invisible (*adṛśya*), and indeed non-perceptible by any faculty at all), actionless (*akarmadhīya*, in its changeless identity), incomprehensible (*agṛhyā*, since It comprehends all), indefinable (*alīkhaṇa*, since It is without any limit), unthinkable (*achintya*, since It cannot be clothed in any form), indescribable (*avyapadeśya*, since It cannot be qualified by any particular attribute or determination), the unique, fundamental essence (*pratyakṣātmā*) of the Self (*Ātmā*, present in all the states), without any trace of the development of manifestation (*prapancha-vyāptihāna*, and consequently absolutely and totally free from the special conditions of any mode of existence whatever), fullness of Peace and Beatitude, without duality : It is *Ātmā* (Itself, outside of and independently of any condition), (thus) It must be known."²

It will be noticed that everything concerning this unconditioned state of *Ātmā* is expressed under a negative form: it is easy to understand why this must be so, since, in language, every direct affirmation is necessarily particular and determinate, the affirmation of something which excludes something else, and which therefore limits the object so affirmed.³ Every determination is a

¹ The two words *Chaturthā* and *Ṭvītyā* have the same meaning and apply to the one identical state. "And so, *Chaturthā* by *Ṭvītyā*"—roughly that which is *Chaturthā*, that is *Ṭvītyā*" (*British-Sanskrit Quarterly*, vol. xv, 2, February 14, 1906, p. 2).

² *Ātmasūtrā* (Sanskrit), verse 7.

³ It is for the same reason that this state is usually called "the Fourth,"—note it cannot be thus referred to in any way;—but this explanation, although quite plain, has escaped the commentators and in this connection we all furnish a curious example of their lack of understanding. If *Chaturthā* signified that the word, "the Fourth," showed that a "logical construction" only was intended, because it recalled one of "the four" divisions of the constitution, etc.—that is an unexpected comparison to say the least, and it would certainly be difficult to justify it, logically.

THE UNCONDITIONED STATE OF ÂTMÂ

limitation, that is to say, a negation¹; consequently, it is the negation of a determination which is a true affirmation, and the apparently negative terms which we find here are, in their real sense, pre-eminently affirmative. So also the word "lilaiva," which has a similar form, expresses in reality the negation of all limit, it is therefore the equivalent of total and absolute affirmation, which comprises or embraces all particular affirmations, but which is not any one affirmation to the exclusion of others, precisely because it implies them all equally and "non-discriminately"²; and it is in this manner that Universal Possibility contains absolutely all possibilities. Everything that can be expressed by means of an affirmative form belongs of necessity to the realm of Being, since this is itself the first affirmation or the first determination, that from which all others proceed, just as unity is the first of numbers whence all others are derived, but here we are no longer in unity but in "non-duality," or, in other words, we are beyond Being for the reason that we are beyond all determination, even principled.³

In itself then *Âtma* is neither manifested (*vyakta*) nor unmanifested (*avyakta*), so long at least as one only regards the unmanifested in the immediate principle of the manifested (which refers to the state of *Prakāśa*): but it is the principle both of the manifested and the unmanifested (although this Supreme Principle can also be said to be unmanifested in a higher sense, if only thereby to proclaim its absolute changelessness and the impossibility of characterizing it by any positive attribution whatsoever).

¹ Spinoza himself has formally recognized this truth. — (*Spinoz. Opera selecta* reprint, etc.). But it is hardly necessary to mention that his application of it is only reminiscent of the determination of *Prakāśa* than of that of *Âtma* in its unconditioned state.

² This point of view in the present sentence is purely metaphorical, but it should be added that the same considerations can also apply from the theological point of view: although the latter ordinary usage within the sphere of Being, there are those who have recognized that "universal theology" alone is strictly valid, or in other words that only absolute. "Such the negative term has properly been defined in *Ātma*. Cp. 58. Character of the Anurūpa, *Prakāśa* in *Mythical Theology*, the last two chapters of which contain the text we have just quoted in a remarkable manner, even down to the expressive word.

THE UNCONDITIONED STATE OF ĀTMĀ

"It (the Supreme Brahma, with which unconditioned Ātma is identical), the eye does not attain to,¹ nor speech, nor the mind; we do not recognise it (as comprehensible by sight other than itself) and it is for this reason that we do not know how to express its nature (by means of any sort of description). It is superior to what is known (distinctively, or superior to the manifested Universe) and it is even beyond what is not known (distinctively, or beyond the unmanifested Universe, one with pure Being?); such is the teaching that we have received from the wise men of former times. It should be realised that That which is not manifested by speech (nor by anything else), but by which speech is manifested (as well as everything else), is Brahma (in Its Infinity), and not what is looked upon (as an object of meditation) as "this" (an individual being or a manifested world, according as the point of view refers to the microcosm or the macrocosm) or "that" (Isiware or Universal Being itself, outside all individualisation and all manifestation)."²

Śaṅkarācārya adds the following commentary to this passage: "A disciple who has attentively followed the exposition of the nature of Brahma must be led to suppose that he knows Brahma perfectly (at least in theory), but, in spite of his apparent justification for thinking so, this is nevertheless an erroneous opinion. In actual fact the well established meaning of every text concerning the

¹ Similarly the Ātma eye is speaking of "that" - "The eye cannot reach Him." The Ātma eye is spoken rather by sight not by hearing (Chāndogya, chapter 3.11.1. Father Winger's translation, page 391).

² Here, the eye stands for the faculty of sensation and speech for the faculty of action. We have just shown that man, by nature and function, participates in both alike. Brahma cannot be reached by any individual faculty: It cannot, like gross objects, be perceived by the senses, nor conceived by thought, like subtle objects. It cannot be expressed in words made by words, nor in thought made through mental images.

³ Cf. the passage already quoted from the Śāṅkhya-Sūtra, IV, 18, according to which Perceptual - determinate the determinable and even the indeterminate - the determinable is the manifested and the undetermined, the unmanifested, those in the sense that we have just explained.

⁴ *Ātma* (Universal, Absolute, etc.) is used in 1 to 3. After this has said of speech (and) is that necessarily repeated in 4 to 6 and 7 the *ātma* term about the "mental faculty" (mind), the eye (sensation), hearing (action) and lastly about the "vast breadth" (space).

THE UNCONDITIONED STATE OF *AIMA*

Pratibha is that the Self of every being who possesses Knowledge is identical with *Brahma* (since through that very Knowledge the "Supreme Identity" is realized). Now a distinct and definite knowledge is possible in respect of everything capable of becoming an object of knowledge: but it is not possible in the case of That which cannot become such an object. That is *Brahma*, for It is the (total) Known, and the Knower can know other things (encompassing them all within Its infinite comprehension, which is identical with Universal Possibility), but cannot make itself the object of its own knowledge (for, in Its identity, which is not the result of any identification, one cannot even make the principal distinction, as in the condition of *Pratibha*, between a subject and an object which are nevertheless "the same," and It cannot cease to be itself "all-knowing" in order to become "all-known," which would be another itself), in the same way that fire can burn other things but cannot burn itself (its essential nature being indivisible just as, analogically, *Brahma* is "without duality").¹ Neither can it be said that *Brahma* is able to become an object of knowledge for anything other than itself, since outside itself there is nothing which can possess knowledge (all knowledge, even relative, being but a participation in absolute and supreme knowledge).²

Hence it is said in the succeeding passage of the text: "If you think that you know (*Brahma*) well, what you know of Its nature is a reality but false; for this reason *Brahma* should be still more intensely considered by you. (The reply is as follows.) I do not think that I know It; by that I mean to say that I do not know It well (directly, as I should know an object capable of being described or defined); nevertheless I know It (according to the

¹ Cf. *Shukla-Yajurveda Upanishad, Adhyaya 4, Brikhatsu 2, verse 12*.

² "How could the Knower (self) be known?"

³ Here again, one can establish a comparison with the following phrase from the *Upanishad on Udaya (Shukla-Yajurveda)* of *Shvetashvatara*, IV, 10, 11:

"There is nothing, absolutely nothing, that keeps apart from Him (Ishvara), and He comprehends this also, substance without, pervading this comprehensions existing in my narrow egoism."

THE UNCONDITIONED STATE OF ĀTMĀ

instruction I have received concerning its nature). Whoever among us understands the following words (in their true meaning): 'I do not know It, and yet I know It,' verily that man knows It. He who thinks that *Brahma* is not comprehended (by any faculty), by him *Brahma* is comprehended (for by the knowledge of *Brahma* he has become really and effectively identical with *Brahma* itself); but he who thinks that *Brahma* is comprehended (by some sensible or mental faculty) knows It not. *Brahma* (as *Īśā*,¹ in its incommunicable nature) is unknown to those who know It (after the manner of some object of knowledge, be it a particular being or Universal Being) and It is known to those who do not know It at all (as "this" or "that")."

¹ *Āyana-Pravāśa*, Chapter II, śloka 1 to 3. Here is an often-quoted Tamil text: "The teacher said: 'I do not know the Principle. The answer is proffered. I know not. I know the Principle. The answer is repeated.' The teacher was right in saying that he knew nothing about the essence of the Principle. I know not. I do not know It as I know It in regard to its essential manifestations. . . . Not to know It is to know It by its essence." To know It (in its manifestations) is not to know It (as it really is). Not here is one to understand this, that, as by not knowing It that It is known! Thus in this way, says the Pratiśodhaka Śāstra. The Principle cannot be heard. . . . that which is heard is not It. The Principle cannot be seen. . . . that which is viewed is not It. . . . The Principle, not being cognizable, cannot be detailed either. Whoever asks questions about the Principle and whoever answers them, both show that they do not know what the Principle is. Consider the Principle, and you neither ask and still answer what It is" (*Chandogya*, chapter X.23). Author Wager's translation, page 399-400.

CHAPTER XVI

THE SYMBOLICAL REPRESENTATION OF *Ātma* AND ITS CONDITIONS BY THE SACRED MONOSYLLABLE *Om*

THE rest of the *Māhātmya Upaniṣad* is concerned with the correspondence of the sacred monosyllable *Om* and its elements (*akṣarāḥ*) with *Ātma* and its conditions (*padārthāḥ*). It explains on the one hand the symbolical reasons for this correspondence and, on the other hand, the effects of meditation bearing both on the symbol and on what it represents, that is to say on *Om* and on *Ātma*, the former playing the part of "support" for straining to knowledge of the latter. We will now give the translation of this final portion of the text; but it will not be possible to accompany it with a complete commentary, as that would carry us too far from the subject of the present study.

"This *Ātma* is represented by the (supreme) syllable *Om*, which is represented in its turn by letters (*akṣarāḥ*), (in such a way that) the conditions (of *Ātma*) are the *akṣarāḥ* (of *Om*), and (conversely) the *akṣarāḥ* (of *Om*) are the conditions (of *Ātma*); these are A, U and M.

"*Prāṇa-jñāna*, whose seat is in the waking state, is (represented by) A, the first *akṣar*, because it is the connection (*dhātū*) of all sounds, the primordial sound A, uttered by the organs of speech in their normal position, being as it were imminent in all the others, which are varied modifications of it—and which are unified to it, just as *Prāṇa-jñāna* is present in all things in the sensible world and establishes their unity), and also because it is the beginning (*śūro*, both of the alphabet and of the monosyllable *Om*, as *Prāṇa-jñāna* is the first of the conditions of *Ātma* and the base starting from which metaphysical realisation, for the human being, must be accomplished).

SYMBOLICAL REPRESENTATION OF ĀTMA

He who knows this verily obtains (the realisation of) all his desires (since, through his identification with *Paśāṇāsura*, all sensible objects become dependent upon him and form an integral part of his own being), and he becomes the best (in the order of *Paśāṇāsura* or of *Prōḥ*), of which he makes himself the centre by virtue of that very knowledge and by the identification it implies when once it is fully effective).

"*Tajasa*, the seat of which is in the dream state, is (represented by) *U*, the second *mātrā*, because it is the elevation (*āstherika*, of sound from its first modelity, just as the subtle state is, in formal manifestation, of a more exalted order than the gross state) and also because it participates in both (*ājñeya*, that is to say, alike by its nature and by its position, it is intermediate between the two extreme elements of the monosyllabic *Om*, just as the dream state is intermediate, *amāyā*, between waking and deep sleep). He who knows this in truth advances along the path of Knowledge (by his identification with *Āharaṇagarbha*), and (being thus illuminated) he is in harmony (*samāna*, with all things, for he beholds the manifested Universe as the product of his own knowledge, which cannot be separated from him), and none of his descendants (in the sense of "spiritual potency") will be ignorant of *Brahma*.

"*Prōḥa*, the seat of which is in the state of deep sleep, is (represented by) *M*, the third *mātrā*, because it is the measure (*janā*, of the two other *mātrās*, as in a mathematical ratio the denominator is the measure of the numerator), as well as because it is the end (of the monosyllabic *Om*, considered as containing the synthesis of all sounds, in the same way that the unmanifested contains, synthetically and in principle, the whole of the manifested with its diverse possible modes . the letter can indeed be considered as returning into the unmanifested, from which it was never dis-

* In this sense the expression has a more particular connection here with the "World-Egg" and the cyclic time, by reason of the identification with *Āharaṇagarbha*.

SYMBOLICAL REPRESENTATION OF ATMA

fringed here in a contingent and transitory manner; the first cause is at the same time the final cause, and the end is necessarily identical with the principle).¹ He who knows this is in truth the measure of this whole (that is to say the aggregate of the "three worlds" or of the different degrees of universal Existence, of which pure Being is the "determinant"),² and he becomes the final term (of all things, by concentration in his own Self or personality, where all the states of manifestation of his being are rediscovered, "transformed" into permanent possibilities).³

¹ In order to understand the symbolism we have just indicated it must be borne in mind that the words *a* and *y* are combined in the word *ay*, and that the order in to speak here itself is the final moral result of *ay*, without however being supposed altogether, but in the faculty of philosophy itself probably, even while becoming indignant and incomprehensible. Furthermore, the geometrical figures that correspond respectively to the three worlds are 1. circle line, 2. semi-circle (or rather its diameter of a square) and 3. point, the first symbolising the complete unfolding of manifestation, the second, a state of development relative to that unfolding, but nevertheless still developed or manifested, the third, the lowest state devoid of "development" or special limiting conditions that is to say the unmanifested. It will also be noticed that the point is, the primordial principle of all geometrical figures, representing in its own order the first and valuable step, in the same way that the unmanifested is the principle of all states of manifestation, the state of the point is natural symbol of pure Being.

² Were it not to involve too lengthy a digression, it would be possible to enter into a number of interesting considerations of a linguistic nature concerning the expression given to Being, considered as the "cosmological subject" and "diversified appearance". We will merely remark that in Sanskrit the same name (*ī*) is united to the symbol in particular. This aspect of Being is described in the Hindu teaching as "encompassed" or "He who encompasses Himself", in Christian theology it is the Father Who is considered as the *divine possessor*; the Neo-Platonist symbolism of the Dragon himself refers to it.

³ It is only in the state of incarnation, and not in the individual state, that it can be said truly that "that is the measure of all things, of those things which are as or far as they are, and of those things which are not as or far as they are not," that is to say, metaphysically, of the manifested and the unmanifested, although, simply speaking, one cannot speak of a "measure" of the unmanifested, if by "measure" is meant a determination by special conditions of existence, like those dealing with state of manifestation. On the other hand, it goes without saying that the Greek, mystical Plotinus, who is supposed to be the author of this formula, we have just quoted (discovering the same in order to apply it to "Universal Man"), was obviously very far from having arrived at this conception, by applying it to the individual human being, as only possible to achieve, or it when the measure would call a natural "reference" whereas, for us, it implies something quite different, as will be readily understood by those who know the relationship existing between "Universal Man" and the Divine Word (or particularly St. Paul, I Cor. i. 30).

SYMBOLICAL REPRESENTATION OF ĀTMA

"The Fourth is "non-characterized" (*anātha*, unconditioned therefore): it is actionless (*apramādyā*), without any trace of the development of manifestation (*prapañca-sphoṭana*), standing in Itself and without duality (*Ekam Advaita*); that is *Caśita* (the sacred monosyllable considered independently of its *śakti*), that essentially is *Ātma* (in Itself, outside of and independently of any condition or determination whatever, even of the principal determination which is *Being* itself). He who knows this enters truly into his own "Self" by means of that same "Self" (without intermediary of any order whatsoever, without the use of any instrument such as a faculty of knowing, which can only attain to a state of the "Self" and not to *Paramātmā*, the supreme and absolute "Self")."¹

As for the effects which are to be obtained by means of meditation (*opādhyāsa*) upon the monosyllable *Om*, in each of its three *śaktis* to begin with, and afterwards in itself and independently of its *śakti*, we will only add that these effects correspond to the realization of different spiritual degrees, which may be described in the following manner: the first is the full development of the corporeal individuality, the second is the integral extension of the human individuality in its extra-corporeal modalities; the third is the attainment of the super-individual states of being; finally, the fourth is the realization of the "Supreme Identity."²

¹ *Atmabodha Upaniṣad*, stanza 8 to 10. Concerning the meditation on *Om* and its effects in various stages, especially in the three *śaktis*, further indications can be found in the *Pravāṇa Upaniṣad*, Prasthāna 6, stanza 1 to 7. Also see *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Prasthāna 8 (Stanzas 1, 2 and 3).

CHAPTER XVII

THE PERSISTENT EVOLUTION OF THE HUMAN BEING

So far we have been considering the constitution of the human being, as also its different states, on the assumption that it subsists as a compound of the various elements that go to make up its nature, that is to say during the continuance of its individual life. It is necessary to emphasise the fact that the states which properly belong to the individual as such, that is to say not only the gross or corporeal state, as is obvious, but also the subtle state (provided of course that only the extra-corporeal modalities of the integral human state are included in it and not the other individual states of the being), are strictly and essentially states of the living man. This does not necessarily involve admitting that the subtle state comes to an end at the precise moment of bodily death and simply as a result thereof; on the contrary we shall see later on that a passage of the being into the subtle form takes place at that moment; but this passage is only a transitory phase in the resorption of the individual faculties from the manifested into the unmanifested, a phase the existence of which is quite naturally accounted for by the intermediate position occupied by the subtle state. It is however true that it may be necessary to envisage, in a particular sense and in certain cases at least, a prolongation and even an indefinite prolongation of the human individuality, which must needs be referred to the subtle, that is to say to the extra-corporeal modalities of that individuality. But such a prolongation is in no wise identical with the subtle state as it existed during earthly life. It must in fact be clearly understood that under the single heading of "subtle state" we are obliged to include extremely varied

POSTHUMOUS EVOLUTION

and complex modalities, even though we confine our viewpoint to the realm of purely human possibilities only; it is for this reason that we have taken care from the very beginning to point out that the term "subtle state" should always be understood relatively to the corporeal state, taken as a starting point and term of comparison, it thereby acquires a precise meaning solely by contrast to the latter state which, for its part, appears sufficiently well defined by the fact that it is the state in which we find ourselves at the present moment. Furthermore it will have been observed that among the five envelopes of the "Self" three are regarded as contributing to make up the subtle form (whereas one only corresponds to each of the other two conditioned states of *Atmā*, in the one case because it really is only one particular and determinate modality of the individual, and in the other case because it is an essentially unified and "non-distinguished" state), and this is a further clear proof of the complexity of the state in which the Self uses this form as its vehicle, and this complexity must always be borne in mind if one is to follow the description of the different aspects from which it can be envisaged.

We have now to turn to the question of what is commonly called the "posthumous evolution" of the human being, that is to say to the consideration of the consequences for that being of death or—to explain more precisely what we mean by that term—of the dissolution of the compound which we have been discussing and which constitutes his actual individuality. It should be observed moreover that when this dissolution has taken place there is strictly speaking no longer any human being left, since it is essentially this compound which constitutes the individual man; the sole case where it is still possible to call the being in a certain sense human must then, after bodily death, it remains in one of those prolongations of the individuality to which we have already alluded: in that case, although the individuality is no longer complete from the standpoint of manifestation (since the corporeal state is henceforth

POSTHUMOUS EVOLUTION

lacking, the possibilities corresponding to it having completed the whole cycle of their development), nevertheless certain of its popular or subtle elements subsist without being dissociated. In all other cases the being cannot any longer be called human since it has passed out of the state to which that term applies and into another state, either individual or otherwise; thus the being which was formerly human has ceased to be so in order to become something else, in the same way that, through birth, it became human by passing from some other state into the state which we at present occupy. Besides, if birth and death be understood in their widest sense, that is to say as changes of state, it becomes at once apparent that they are modifications which correspond analogically to one another, being the beginning and the end of a cycle of individual existence; and indeed, if one were to place oneself outside the special viewpoint of a given state in order to observe the inter-connection of the different states with one another, it would be seen that they constitute strictly equivalent phenomena, death to one state being at the same time birth into another. In other words the same modification is either death or birth according to the state or cycle of existence in relation to which it is considered, since it marks the exact point common to both states or the transition from one to the other; and what is here true for different states is also true, on a different plane, for the various modalities of a given state, where these modalities are regarded as constituting, in the development of their respective possibilities, so many secondary cycles which are integrated in the unity of a more comprehensive cycle.¹ Finally, it is particularly important to add that "specification," according to the sense in which we have already used the expression (that is to say in the sense of attachment to a definite species

¹ These considerations relating to birth and death are moreover applicable to the great old view of the "metempsychosis" as well as to that of the "transmigration." Though this is not the place to engage on this theme, perhaps they nevertheless gather some idea of how the simplest consequences affect the theory of cosmic cycles.

POSTHUMOUS EVOLUTION

such as the human species, which imposes certain general conditions upon a being, thus constituting its specific nature) is valid only within a given state and cannot be applied outside it. This must obviously be true, since the species is in no wise a transcendent principle in relation to this individual state, but pertains exclusively to the same domain, being itself subject to the limiting conditions which define that domain. For this reason the being who has passed into a different state is no longer human, since it no longer belongs in any way to the human species.¹

The expression "posthumous evolution" calls for certain reservations, since it is only too liable to give rise to a number of ambiguities. In the first place, death being conceived as the dissolution of the human compound, the word "evolution" clearly cannot be understood here in the sense of an individual development, since we are concerned on the contrary with a reabsorption of the individuality into the unmanifested state²; this would amount rather to an "involution" from the particular point of view of the individual. Etymologically indeed these terms "evolution" and "involution" signify nothing more nor less than "development" and "envelopment"³; but we are well aware that in modern language the word "evolution" has acquired quite a different meaning, which has almost converted it into a synonym for "progress." We have already had ample opportunities for expressing our views upon these quite recent ideals of "progress" and "evolution" which, by expanding

¹ It will be apparent that in the present context we are using the word "human" only in its precise and literal sense, as applying solely to individual man. There is no question here of the metaphysical transposition that makes possible the conception of "Universal Man."

² It cannot moreover be said that this entails a destruction of the individuality; because, in the unmanifested, the possibilities constituting it subsist as potentialities in a permanent manner, together with all the other possibilities of the being; nevertheless, since the individuality exists no more, only its manifestations. It may easily be said that on re-entering only the unmanifested it reverts, dissipated or closer to what was individuality. It is not manifest that this is so, but only in that sense, it would be possible to apply these terms to the two phases that are distinguished in every cycle of existence here, as we have already explained.

POSTHUMOUS EVOLUTION

themselves beyond all measure, have had the effect of completely corrupting the present-day Western mentality; it would be pointless to repeat ourselves here. We will merely recall that "progress" can only validly be spoken of in quite a relative sense, care always being taken to define in what respect it is used and within what limits; reduced to these proportions it no longer retains anything in common with that absolute "progress" which began to be spoken of towards the end of the XVIIIth century and which our contemporaries are pleased to adorn with the name of "evolution," an expression that has a more "scientific" sound to their ears. Oriented thought, like ancient thought in the West, could not admit this notion of "progress," except in the relative sense that we have just given to it, that is to say as an idea of secondary importance, quite limited in scope and devoid of any metaphysical significance, since it belongs to that category of ideas which can only be applied to possibilities of a particular order and is not transposable outside certain limits. The "evolutionary" point of view does not admit of universalisation and it is not possible to conceive of the real being as something which "evolves" between two definite points or which "progresses," even indefinitely, in a fixed direction; such conceptions are devoid of meaning and show complete ignorance of the most elementary metaphysical principles. At the most one might speak in a particular sense of the "evolution" of the being, in order to convey the idea of a passage to a higher state; but even then it would be necessary to make a reservation preserving the full relativity of the term used, as concerns the being regarded in itself and in its totality, there can never be any question either of "evolution" or of "revolution" in any sense whatever, its essential identity being in no way altered by particular and contingent modifications of any sort, which can only affect one or other of its conditioned states.

A further reservation requires to be made with regard to the use of the word "posthumous": it is only from the

POSTHUMOUS EVOLUTION

particular point of view of human individuality and in so far as it is conditioned by time that one can speak of what is produced "after death" and likewise of what took place "before birth," so long at least as it is intended to preserve for the words "before" and "after" the chronological meaning which they normally convey. In themselves the states in question, if they exist outside the realm of human individuality, are in no wise temporal states and consequently cannot be situated chronologically; this is true moreover even of those states which include among their conditions some other mode of duration, that is to say of succession, once it is no longer temporal succession that is in question. As for the unmanifested state, it goes without saying that it lies outside all succession, so that the notions of anteriority and posteriority, even taken in the widest possible sense, cannot be applied to it in any way whatsoever. In this respect it may be remarked that, even during its lifetime, the being loses the action of time when its consciousness has quitted the individual realm, as occurs in deep sleep and in ecstatic trances; so long as it remains in either of these states, which are truly unmanifested, time no longer exists for it.

Mission must still be made of the case where the posthumous state takes the form of a simple prolongation of the human individuality: this prolongation, it is true, may be regarded as "perpetuity," that is to say as temporal indefinitude, or in other words as a mode of succession which still belongs to time (since we are not concerned with a state subject to conditions other than our own); but the time in question no longer has anything in common with the time in which bodily existence is carried on. Furthermore such a state is not among those which are of particular interest from the metaphysical point of view since, on the contrary, from that point of view it is the possibility of passing beyond individual conditions which must always be borne in mind rather than the possibility of remaining in them indefinitely; if we feel obliged, however, to refer to that state, it is chiefly for the sake of future into account

all possible cases and also because, as will be apparent here, this prolongation of human existence promises for the being the possibility of obtaining "Deliverance" without passing through other individual states. However, leaving aside this last case, the following may be said: "if non-human states are spoken of as situated "before birth" or "after death," this is primarily because they appear so in relation to human individuality; but it is also most important to realize that it is not the individuality which enters these states or which passes through them successively, since they are states which lie outside its sphere and which do not concern it as an individuality. Furthermore there is a sense in which the notions of anteriority and posteriority may be applied quite independently of the point of view of succession, temporal or otherwise; we are referring to that order, at the same time logical and ontological, in which the various states are interconnected and determine one another; thus if one state is the consequence of another, it may be said to be posterior to it. In such a manner of speaking we are being made of the temporal symbolism which serves to express the entire theory of cycles, although, metaphysically, it must always be remembered that there is perfect simultaneity between all the states, the point of view of actual succession being applicable only within a particular given state.

The foregoing remarks have been made with a view to forestalling any tendency to attribute to the expression "posthumous evolution" (where it is thought advisable to use it in the absence of a more adequate term and in order to conform to certain habits of expression) an importance and a significance which it does not and could not really possess. We will now proceed to study those processes to which it relates, an understanding of which springs almost immediately from all the foregoing considerations. The exposition which follows is taken from the *Brahma-Sutra*² and from their traditional commentary (and by that

² *Atishaya IV*, *Prakāśa* 2, 3, and 4. The first *Prakāśa* of this fourth *Atishaya* is devoted to the exposition of the means of attaining Divine Knowledge, the fruits of which will be set forth in the following chapters.

POSTHUMOUS EVOLUTION

we especially have in mind the commentary of Shikama-chargé), but we must point out that it is not a literal translation; here and there we shall find it necessary to summarise the commentary¹ and also to comment upon it in its turn, without which the summary would remain practically incomprehensible, as in fact very often happens where the interpretation of Oriental texts is concerned.²

¹ Colabaire has given a summary of the text in his "*Manus on the Philosophy of the Mind*" (Paris 1871) but the interpretation, though it is not dictated by a systematic perspective such as is only too frequent among WMG' scholars, is extremely defective from the standpoint of accuracy, style and simply through a lack of metaphysical insight.

² It may be remarked, as characteristic, that in Arabic the word *tafsir* (which means both "translation" and "commentary," the one being looked upon as inseparable from the other) in almost identical would translate as "explanation" or "interpretation." It has even to said, when translated into any context, that a translation into a vernacular tongue, to be intelligible, should correspond exactly to a commentary written in the exact language of the text; a literal translation from an Oriental into a Western language is usually impossible and the more one strives to keep fidelity to the letter, the greater the danger of losing the spirit; thus it is in itself almost philosophically unfortunate even impossible of grasping.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE REABSORPTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACULTIES

"When a man is about to die, speech, followed by the remainder of the ten external faculties (the five faculties of action and the five faculties of sensation, manifested outwardly by means of the corresponding organs, but not identical with those organs themselves since they separate from them at this stage)¹ is reabsorbed into the inward sense (*manas*), the activity of the external organs ceasing to an end before that of this inward faculty (which is thus the final term of all the other individual faculties in question, just as it is their starting point and common source).² This latter faculty thereupon withdraws in the same way into the "vital breath" (*prana*), accompanied as its turn by all the vital functions (the five *vajras*, which are modalities of *prana* and thus return into an undifferentiated state), these functions being inseparable from life itself; furthermore this same retreat of the inward sense is also to be observed in deep sleep and in ecstatic trance (accompanied by complete cessation of every external manifestation of consciousness)."³ We may add however that this cessation does not always necessarily imply total suspension of bodily sensibility, which constitutes a kind of organic consciousness, if one may describe it so, but under these circumstances the individual consciousness properly so-called will play no part in the manifestations of this sensibility, being no longer in communication with it as it normally is in the ordinary states of the living being, and the reason for this is easily understood, since, in point of fact, the

¹ Speech is mentioned last, when these faculties are considered in the order of their development; it must therefore be the first in the order of their disappearance, since the order is now reversed.

² Cf. *Samkhya Sūtras*, Pratyakha VI, Khanda 4, verse 2.

REABSORPTION OF INDIVIDUAL FACULTIES

individual consciousness no longer exists in the cases referred to, the real consciousness of the being having been transformed into a different state, which is really a super-individual state. This organic consciousness to which we are alluding is not a consciousness in the true sense of the word, but it participates therein in some manner, owing its origin to the individual consciousness, of which it is a kind of reflection; separated from the latter it amounts to no more than a mere illusion of consciousness, but it can still present the appearance of consciousness to those who are only aware of externals,¹ in the same way that, after death, the persistence of certain more or less dissociated psychic elements, when they are able to manifest themselves, are able to present a similar and no less illusory appearance, as we have already explained in a different connection.²

"The 'vital breath,' accompanied similarly by all the other functions and faculties (already reabsorbed into it and subsisting there as possibilities only, having now reverted to the state of indifferenciation whence they had to go forth in order to manifest themselves effectively during life) returns in its turn into the 'living soul' (defined, particular manifestation of the "Self" at the centre of the human individuality, distinguishing itself from the 'Self' so long as that individuality endures as such, although this distinction is in fact purely illusory from the standpoint of absolute reality, where there is nothing different from the 'Self'); and it is this 'living soul' which (as the reflection of the 'Self' and central

¹ Just as, in a magical operation, even the most complete sorcerer does not always permit the critical components of good.

² The organic consciousness, we have just mentioned, certainly exists only when the psychologist calls the "subconscious," but there shall not be to imply that they have sufficiently explained a thing when all they have really done is to give it a name, besides, seeing that knowing they have recorded the most inconspicuous collection of elements, without even being able to make a distinction between what is really conscious in some degree and what only appears to be so. Nor have they distinguished between the process "subconscious" and the "superconscious," in other words between factors capable of states that are collectively lighter and lower in relation to the human state.

principle of the individuality) governs the whole body of individual faculties (regarded in their integrality and not merely in their relationship with the bodily modality).¹ As a king's servants gather round him when he is about to go forth upon a journey, even so all the vital functions and faculties (external and internal) of the individual gather round the 'living soul' (or rather wait on it, out of which they all issue and into which they are all reabsorbed) at the final moment (of life in the ordinary sense of the word, that is to say of manifested existence in the gross state), when this 'living soul' is about to retire from its bodily form.² Accompanied thus by all its faculties (since it contains them and preserves them in itself as possibilities)³ it withdraws, in an individual luminous essence (that is to say in the subtle form, which is compared to a fiery vehicle, as we saw when studying *Tajana*, the second condition of *Amid*) composed of the five *manuira* or super-sensible elementary constructs (just as the bodily form is composed of the five *dhimas* or corporeal and sensible elements), into a subtle state (in contrast to the gross state which is that of external or corporeal manifestation, of which the cycle is now completed so far as concerns the individual in question).

"Consequently (by reason of this passage into the subtle form, looked upon as luminous), the 'vital breath' is said to retire into the Light, which does not mean to say the igneous principle exclusively (since we are really concerned with an individualized reflection of the intelligible Light, that is to say a reflection the nature of which is fundamentally the same as that of the moral faculty during corporeal life, and which moreover implies

¹ It may be noticed that *prajñā*, although it is collectively manifest in vegetation, is in itself distinct from the latter, since it would obviously be meaningless to say that vegetation, a physiological function, separates from the vegetative and is subordinated to the "living soul". We will remind the reader once more that *prajñā* and its various modalities belong essentially to the subtle state.

² *Arishad-dharmapala Upanishad*, Adhyaya IV, Bhattasana 3, *śloka* 38.

³ A faculty is properly a power, that is to say a possibility, which is, in itself, quite independent of its actual exercise.

REABSORPTION OF INDIVIDUAL FACILITIES

a combination of the essential principles of all five elements as its support or vehicle), nor does this withdrawal necessarily imply an instantaneous transition, since a traveller is said to go from one city to another even though he may pass successively through one or several intermediate cities.

"Furthermore this withdrawal or this abandonment of the bodily form (as described so far) is common alike to the ignorant person (*avasthita*) and to the contemplative Sage (*vidvān*) up to the point at which their respective (and henceforth different) paths branch; and immortality (*amaya*, but without immediate Union with the Supreme *Brahma* being thereupon attained) is the fruit of simple meditation (*apāna*), carried out during life without having been accompanied by any effective renunciation of the being's higher states, although the individual barriers resulting from ignorance (*avidyā*) may not yet be completely destroyed."

An important comment is called for here as to the sense in which the immortality in question is to be understood: we have in fact pointed out elsewhere that the Sanskrit word *amaya* applies exclusively to a state which is beyond all change, whereas, by the corresponding word, Westerners merely mean an extension of the possibilities of the human order, consisting in an indefinite prolongation of life (what the Far-Eastern tradition calls "longevity") under conditions which are to a certain degree transposed, but which always remain more or less similar to those of terrestrial existence, since they likewise concern the human individuality. Now in the present instance the state described is still an individual state and nevertheless it is said that immortality can be obtained therein; this may appear inconsistent with what we have just remarked, since it might be supposed that relative immortality only is meant, understood according to the Western sense actually; however that is not the case. It is indeed true that in order to be fully effective, immortality, in the meta-

¹ *Pravacana-Sādhana, Adhyāya IV, Pāda 3, śloka 1 to 7*

physical and Oriental sense, can only be obtained beyond all conditional states, individual or otherwise, in such a way that, being absolutely independent of any possible mode of succession, it is identical with Eternity itself; it would thus amount to an abuse of language to make this word apply to temporal "perpetuity" or to the indefinitude of any type of duration; but it is not in that sense that the expression is to be understood here. It must be realized that the idea of death is essentially synonymous with a change of state, which, as we have already remarked, is its widest acceptance; and when it is said that the being has virtually attained immortality, that is taken to mean that it will not need to pass through further conditioned states different from the human state, or to traverse other cycles of manifestation. This is not yet "Deliverance" actually realized, whereby immortality would be rendered effective, since the "individual barriers," that is to say the restrictive conditions to which the being is subject, are not entirely destroyed; but it implies the possibility of obtaining that "Deliverance" directly from the human state, in the prolongation of which the being is maintained for the whole duration of the cycle to which that state belongs (which constitutes perpetuity properly so-called); the being is thus enabled to take part in the final "transformation" which will be accomplished when the cycle is completed, causing everything that is then contained within it to return to the principal state of non-manifestation.¹ This is why the name "deferred Deliverance" or

¹ The Greek word *salvos* really means "perpetual" and not "eternal," for it is distinct from *aiôn*, the name of the Latin word which means an indefinite cycle; and this was also the original meaning of the Latin *salvus* (French *sauf*) by which it is sometimes translated.

² *Salvos* could be met on the subject of the transmutation of the final "transformation" into theological language in the Western religious and especially about the conception of the "Last Judgment" which is already tinged up with it. But this would require extensive explanations and we accomplished an expedition to be undertaken here, all the more so since, in practice, the characteristically religious part of man keeps short at the consummation of a secondary cycle, beyond which a continuation of existence in the individual-being state only can have to be taken into account; this would not be possible if the cycle to which that state belongs

REASONING OF INDIVIDUAL FACULTIES

"Deliverance by degrees" (*hwasu-sada*) is given to this possibility, since in this manner Deliverance is only obtained by means of intermediate stages (conditional posthumous states) and not in a direct and immediate manner, as in other cases which we shall discuss later on.¹

now being considered as an integrity. This must not be taken to mean, however, that the necessary transposition may not be effected from the religious point of view, as we have already explained when speaking of the "resurrection of the dead" and the "divine body". And, practically speaking, this transposition is not effected by those who cling to ordinary and "external" assumptions, and for which nothing more beyond human individuality. we will, however, leave to the question when referring to the essential difference between the highest notion of "Salvation" and the metaphysical notion of "Deliverance."

¹ It goes without saying that "Delayed Deliverance" is the only ideal that can be envisaged for the vast majority of human beings, which moreover does not mean that all will attain it indifferently, since it is also necessary to consider the risk which a being, not having obtained even salvation on mortality, must run in this greater religious state, in which it will at once enjoy the same possibility of obtaining "Deliverance" as in the human state but also, if one may so express it, the same possibility of not obtaining it.

CHAPTER XIX

DEVELOPMENT IN THE POSTMORAL CONDITION ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE

"So long as it is in this condition (still individual, as has just been explained) the spirit (which, consequently, is still *fratruel*) of that person who has practiced meditation (during his life, without attaining effective possession of the higher stages of his being) remains attached to the subtle form (which may also be regarded as the formal prototype of the individuality, subtle manifestation representing an intermediate stage between the unmanifested and the gross manifestation and playing the part of mediating principle in relation to the latter), and it is associated, in this subtle form, with the vital faculties (in the state of reabsorption or principal contraction which has already been described)." It is admittedly necessary that there should still be a form in which the being can clothe itself, from the fact that its condition still belongs to the individual order; and this can only be the subtle form, since it has left the corporeal form and since moreover the subtle form must subsist after the body, from having preceded it in the order of development in manifested mode, which is reproduced in inverse order in the return to the unmanifested; this does not however mean that this subtle form must in such a case be exactly the same as it was during bodily life, acting as the vehicle of the human being in the dense state.¹ We have already remarked that

¹ There is a certain continuity between the different states of the being and all the more so between the various modalities which go to make up the same state of manifestation. The human individuality, even in its extra-corporeal modalities, must needs be affected by the disappearance of its bodily individuality: moreover there are psychic, mental and other elements which have no reason for coming apart from their relation to bodily existence. Thus the disintegration of the body involves that other elements as well, for they continue to be associated with the body and are consequently also given up by the being at the moment of death, withdrawn in the ordinary sense of the word.

DIFFERENCES IN POSTHUMOUS CONDITIONS

the individual condition itself, in an altogether general way and not merely as concerns the human state, can be defined as that condition in which the being is limited by a form; but it will be appreciated that this form is not necessarily determined as spatial and temporal, as is the case in the particular instance of the bodily state; it can in no wise be so in the non-human states, which are subject not to space and time, but to quite different conditions. As to the subtle form, if it does not altogether escape from time (although such time is not the same as that in which bodily existence is carried on) at least it escapes from space, and that is why one must on no account attempt to picture it as a kind of "double" of the body¹; neither must it be looked upon as a "mould" for the body just because it is declared to be the formal prototype of the individuality at the origin of its manifestation²; we know only too well the Westerner's tendency to resort to the grossest representations and how many serious errors can arise in this way, so that we feel it imperative to offer every possible warning.

"The being may remain thus (in this same individual condition in which it is attached to the subtle form) until the outward dissolution (*pralaya*, the return into the undifferentiated state) of the manifested world (of the actual cycle, comprising both the gross and the subtle

¹ Even the psychologists themselves recognize that the "mental faculty" or individual thought (the only ones they are able to understand, partly outside the spatial conditions) is composed of the aggregate of a "non-spatialized" or static or "latent" the non-spatialized condition of the individual and to suppose that the posthumous states are situated somewhere in space.

² It is this subtle prototype, and not the bodily entity, which is limited as related to by the word *bindu*, as we mentioned before; this prototype represents pre-embodied being, for it is destined to *disincarnate* from the beginning of the manifestation of the cycle, as representing one of the possibilities to be developed during the course of that manifestation; but its pre-embodiment is then only virtual, in the sense that it is not yet a state of the being of which it is destined to become the subtle form, since that being is not actually in the corresponding state, not yet existing, but is to *become* a human individual, and the same manifestation applies by analogy to the bodily form, if one regards it as also preexisting in a certain sense, in the direction of the individual in question, even since the origin of manifest on this earth.

DIFFERENCE IN POSTHUMOUS CONDITIONS

states, that is to say the whole domain of human individuality regarded as its totality),¹ a dissolution in which it is plunged (together with the totality of the beings in these worlds) into the bosom of the Supreme *Beingness*, but, even then, it may be united with *Beingness* only in the same way as in deep sleep (that is to say without full and effective realization of the "Supreme Identity"). In other words and to use the language of certain Western esoteric schools, the case just referred to corresponds to a "reintegration in passive mode," whereas genuine metaphysical realization is a "reintegration in active mode," the only mode which really implies a taking possession by the being of its absolute and final state. This is precisely what is meant by the comparison with deep sleep as it occurs in the life of the ordinary man; just as there is a return from that state to the individual condition, even so there can be a return to another cycle of manifestation for the being who is only united with *Beingness* in "passive mode," showing that the results obtained by the being while in the human state is not put "Deliverance" or true immortality and that its case is in the final instance comparable (although with a notable difference as to the conditions of its new cycle) with that of the being who, instead of remaining until the *pralaya* in the proleptogenesis of the human state, has passed after bodily death into another individual state. Besides this case, there is also the case where the obtaining of higher states and even of the "Supreme Identity," not having been obtained during life in the body, is achieved in the posthumous proleptogenesis of the individuality; here being virtual immortality then becomes effective, although this

¹ Universal manifestation, viewed as a whole is often referred to as *beingness* (by the term *beingness*), as we have explained before, it includes not only these seven cycles, that is to say all states or degrees of existence, each of which terminates on *beingness* like the cycle that goes particularly concerned in this, and really constitutes but one aspect of the *beingness*. Therefore, we will repeat once again, to avoid any possible misunderstanding, that the obtaining here of these cycles is really of a cyclic and not a linear order. In this respect all experiences derive by analogy from the temporal order which is required as priority condition.

DIFFERENCES IN POSTHUMOUS CONDITIONS

may not come about until the very end of the cycle; this is the "deferred Deliverance" of which we have already spoken. In both cases the being, which must be regarded as *ghostly* attached to the subtle form, finds itself for the whole duration of the cycle "incorporated" so to speak in *Hiranyagarbha*, which is considered as *post-phase*, as we have already explained, it remains therefore subject to that special condition of existence which is life (*Jeeva*), by which the true sphere of *Hiranyagarbha* is delimited in the hierarchical order of Existence.

"This subtle form (in which the being, which then remains in the human individual state, resides after death) is (in comparison with the bodily or gross form) imperceptible to the senses both as to its dimensions (that is to say because it is outside the special condition) and as to its consistency (or its particular substance, which is not made up of a combination of corporeal elements); consequently it does not affect the perception (or the external faculties) of those who are present when it separates from the body (after the 'living soul' has withdrawn into it). Neither is it affected by combustion or any other treatment which the body may undergo after death (which is the result of this separation, from the very fact of which no action of a sensible order can have any further repercussion on this subtle form, nor upon the individual consciousness which, remaining attached therein, is no longer connected with the body). It is only possible through its animating heat (its specific quality in so far as it is assimilated to the igneous principle)¹ so long as it inhabits the gross form, which becomes cold (and as a result inert as an organic whole) in death, as soon as it

¹ This word, which we have seen used to designate our thoughts by means of the gesture that it calls up, must not be taken literally, since the mind in question has nothing corporeal about it.

² As we have explained before, this animating warmth, represented as all around him in relations identical with *Pranahuta*, considered as the vital principle at the first of the conditions of life as previously considered, but as the "Sagitt of life" as we shall see presently. *Pranahuta* is the one of the names of *Agni*, and designates one of his functions and particular aspects.

DIFFERENCES IN POSTHUMOUS CONDITIONS

(the subtle form) has left it (although the other sensible qualities of the corporeal form still subsist without any apparent change), and which was warmed (and quickened) by it so long as it dwelt there (since it is precisely in the subtle form that the principle of individual life resides, so that it is only through the commutation of its properties that the body can also be described as alive, by reason of the tie which exists between these two forms in so far as they are the expression of stages of the same being, that is to say, precisely up to the moment of death).

"But he who has obtained (before death, always understood as separation from the body) true knowledge of *Brahma* (implying effective possession of all the states of the being through metaphysical realisation, apart from which there can only be an imperfect and purely symbolical knowledge) does not pass (in successive modes) through all the same stages of withdrawal (or of reabsorption of the individuality from the state of gross manifestation to the state of subtle manifestation, with the different modalities which this implies, and down to the unmanifested state, where individual conditions are at length entirely superseded). He proceeds directly (into this latter state, and even beyond it, if it is only regarded as the principle of manifestation) into Union (already realised, at least virtually, during life in the body¹ with the Supreme *Brahma*, with which he is identified (in an immediate manner), just as a river (here representing the current of existence-through all states and all manifestations), at its mouth (which is the end or final term of that current) becomes identified (by intimate penetration) with the waves of the sea (*Samudra*, the gathering together of the waters, symbolising the conflux of possibilities in the Supreme Principle). His vital faculties and the elements of which his body is composed (all considered in principle

¹As "Union" or the "Supreme Identity" has only been realised virtually, "Deliverance" takes place immediately at the very moment of death; but this Deliverance can also take place during life itself if "Union" has already been realised fully and effectively. The difference between these two cases will be discussed in greater detail further on.

DIFFERENCES IS POSTERIORLY CONTINUOUS

and in their suprasensible essence),⁶ the distinct component parts (*śāradāśāradā*) of the human form (that is to say the five *śrīmān*, senses and the ten faculties of sensation and action), pass completely into the unmanifested state (*ajagadā*, where, by transposition, they are all to be found in permanent mode, as changeless possibilities), this passage moreover applying no change for the being itself (of the kind implied in the intermediate stages, which necessarily include a variety of modifications, since they still belong to "becoming"). Name and Form (*nāmarūpa*, namely the determination of the individual manifestation in its essence and its substance, as has been previously explained) also come to an end (as limiting conditions of the being); and, being "undivided," without the parts or members therefore which composed the earthly form (in the manifested state and in so far as that form was subject to quantity in its various modes),⁷ he is set free from the conditions of individual existence (as well as from all other conditions applying to a special and determined state of existence of any sort, even a supraindividual state, since the being is henceforth in the absolutely unconditioned primordial state).⁸

Several commentators of the *Brhadra-Sūtra*, in order to bring out the nature of this "transformation" more vividly (we take the word in its strictly etymological sense, signifying "passage outside form"), compare it to the disappearance of water sprinkled upon a burning fire.

21 They even suggest, at conceptual level, that the transportation of these elements is effected in such a way that the facility does not disintegrate without leaving any perceptible trace. Instead of being left behind by the being in the material way, it passes over to its contrary either less the value of what the transformed state, or that property signifying there is no death in this conversion, we have elsewhere revealed the logical principles of Space, Matter and Time.

proposed analysis of apostrophe use explicitly named in the following patterns.¹ These last depend on all things in length, number and stress (Hudson & W) the Name, Field, or Phrase (capitalized, weighted, divided) of Morpheme's vowel (closed v, ay or all) corresponding word (the word) in this order (name) that the first two have, are somewhat

[illegible]

DIFFERENCES IN POSTHUMOUS CONDITIONS

more. This water is in fact "transformed" on contact with the stone, at least in the relative sense that it has lost its visible form (though not all form, since it clearly continues to belong to the corporeal order), without however its being possible to say on that account that it has been absorbed by the stone, since, actually, it has evaporated into the atmosphere, where it remains in a state imperceptible to sight.¹ Similarly, the being is in no wise "absorbed" on obtaining "Deliverance," although it may seem so from the point of view of modification, whence the "transformation" appears as a "destruction"; viewed from the standpoint of absolute reality, which alone remains for it, the being is on the contrary diffused beyond all limit, if one may use such an expression (which exactly translates the symbolism of steam from water spreading itself indefinitely through the atmosphere), since it has effectively realized the fulcrum of its possibility.

¹ Contemporary in Bachelard's on the *Water Spirit*.

² That is why *Being*, according to the common interpretation, is linked upon as the "essence," placed in reality by the "transformation."

CHAPTER XX

THE CORONAL ASPIRY AND THE "SOLAR RAY"

We must now return to the examination of what happens to the being who, not being "delivered" at the precise moment of death, has to pass through a series of degrees, represented symbolically in the stages of a journey and forming so many intermediate but not conclusive states which it is necessary to traverse before reaching the final goal. It should be remarked, moreover, that all these states, being still relative and conditioned, have no common measure with that state which alone is absolute and unconditioned; therefore no matter how exalted certain of them may be when compared with the bodily state, it would still seem that by obtaining them the being is no nearer to its final objective, which is "Deliverance"; and the whole of manifestation being strictly *all* in comparison with the Infinite, it is evident that the differences between the states which go to make up manifestation must likewise be *all* in its presence, however considerable they may be in themselves; this holds good as long as the various conditioned states, which those differences separate one from another, are alone taken into account. However, it is none the less true that the passage to certain higher states constitutes as it were an advance towards "Deliverance," but in that case it is gradual (*brahma-mukti*), and may be compared to the use of certain appropriate means, such as those of *Hatha-Yoga*, which are effective as a preparation, although there is certainly no possible comparison between these contingent means and the "Union" which it is *desired* to realize by

using them as "supports."¹ But it must be clearly understood that "Deliverance," when realized, will always imply a discontinuity in relation to the state in which the being who obtains it finds himself and that, no matter what that state may be, this discontinuity will be of exactly the same order, since in all cases, between the state of the "undelivered" and that of the "delivered" being, there is no relationship such as exists between different conditioned states. The same is true even for states which are so far superior to the human state that, looked upon from the point of view of the latter, they might be taken for the goal towards which the being craves ultimately need, and this illusion is possible even with regard to states which are actually only modalities of the human state, although widely separated in every respect from the corporeal modality. It has seemed advisable to draw attention to this point in order to prevent any misunderstanding or erroneous interpretation, before continuing our exposition of the posthumous modalities which the human being can undergo.

"The 'living soul' (*l'âme*), with the vital faculties reabsorbed into it (and remaining there as possibilities, as has already been explained), having withdrawn into its own dwelling place (the centre of the individuality,

¹ An analogy might be drawn between what we have said here and what could likewise be said from the point of view of Catholic doctrine concerning the sacraments: "in the latter also, the sacramental forms are possible-conditions 'supports,' and their ultimately consequent effects produce a break with it. It is of quite a different order than their own. It is by reason of his very nature and of the conditions governing it that the human individual requires such 'supports,' as a preparation for a realization that cannot, far be put, there, and the disproportion between the means and the end corresponds to the fact that the disproportion that exists between the individual state taken as the basis for this realization, and the unconditioned state that is its goal."

We cannot develop here a general theory concerning the efficacy of ordeals; we will content ourselves in saying by way of indicating the essential principle, that everything that is conditioning is so far as it is a modalitative aspect of it by a question of purely negative determination. Hence for the so often viewed as a permanent and immutable possibility, everything that engenders a positive distance must therefore be rediscovered in the Unconditioned, and it is this which allows of a transposition of the individual into the Unconditioned, by the suppression of the limiting (therefore negative) conditions which are inherent in all determination.

THE CORONAL ARTERY

described symbolically as the heart, as we saw at the beginning, wherein it dwells by reason of its being, in essence and independently of its conditions of manifestation, really identical with Parabrahm, from which it is separated only in an illusory manner), the apex (that is to say the most elevated portion) of this subtle organ (pictured as an eight-petalled lotus) shines³ and illuminates the passage through which the soul must pass (to attain the various states about to be described), namely, the crown of the head, if the individual is a Sage (saintly), and another region of the organism (corresponding physiologically to the solar plexus)⁴ if he is ignorant (worldly).⁵ A hundred and one arteries (śrēṇī, likewise subtle and luminous)⁶ issue from the vital centre (as the spokes of a wheel issue from its hub), and one of these (subtle) arteries passes through the crown of the head (the region considered to correspond to the higher states of the being, in so far as their possibilities of communication with the human individual are concerned, as was seen in the description of the members of Paśāṇadhara); it is called *andakāś*.⁷ Besides this *śrēṇī*, which occupies a central position, there

¹ Clearly this is another of those words which must be understood contextually, like *ways*: there is no question here of specific fire, but rather of a manifestation of the weathering fire.

¹ The novel presents, in, its main aspect, their relationship in the adult house (as long as it is far) is linked to the family home as symbolically depicted as a "sacred" (sacred) or again as "inferno" (inferno or hell).

¹ *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing & Taxation*, 13(1), 1-20.

1. We would remind the reader that here we are not concerned with the healthy activities of the blood stream, any more than with patients contracting the bit that we breathe; it is a nursing point obvious that, as the capillary closes, there cannot be any direct passing through the circuit of the blood since no opening exists in that region of the organism. On the other hand, it should be observed that although the process withdrawal of plasma implies that the body has been already lost attention, all patients before this and the white form has not yet been taken off in the form of any new substance, since in describing the behavior of a cell possible to speak of the various water vapor according to the correspondence which hold good during physiological life.

† *Excluded from the analysis because of missing data on the primary outcome.*

THE CORONAL ARTERY

are two others which play a particularly important part (possibly as regards the correspondence in the subtle order with respiration, and consequently in the practices of *Hatha-Yoga*), the one, situated on its right, is called *pingalā*, the other, on its left, is called *idā*. It is said furthermore that *pingalā* corresponds to the sun and *idā* to the moon; now we have seen above that the sun and the moon are described as the two eyes of *Īśvaraśakti*; these then are related respectively to the two *śaktis* in question, while *anāhata*, being in the centre, is related to the 'third eye,' that is to say to the frontal eye of *Śivaśakti*, but we can only point out these connections in passing, since they lie outside our present subject.

"By this passage (ascend) and the crown of the head where it finishes), as a result of knowledge acquired and of consciousness of the meditated path (consciousness belonging essentially to an extra-temporal order, since, even when viewed in the human state, it is a reflection of higher states),² the soul of the Sage, endowed (by virtue of the

¹ In the aspect of this symbolism which refers to the temporal as above, the Sun and the right eye correspond to the future, the Moon and the left eye to the past. The frontal eye corresponds to the present which from the point of view of the momentary is but an imperceptible moment comparable to the geometrical point without dimensions in the spatial order. But is why a single look from the third eye destroys all manifestation (which is expressed symbolically by saying that it makes everything in white), and that is also why it is not represented by any bodily organ. But when one sees above the clearest point of view, the object is seen as nothing all neither (not as the point earlier within it) all of the possibilities of objects, and when success is attained it transcends it simultaneously. All things that is the 'eternal present,' so that the apparent destruction is really a 'glorification.' This symbolism is identical with that of Jesus before the Pontius, who had two faces, the one turned towards the past and the other towards the future, but when real face, the one that goes on the present, is nothing of the two that can be seen.

It can also be pointed out that the *pingalā* *śakti*, by virtue of the same correspondence we have just mentioned, has a special connection with what might be called, in Western language, 'human objects,' wherein the signifier is represented in the Hatha *śāstra*, the *śakti* apart from the different terminology employed, clearly recognisable (*Hatha-Yoga*).

² Therefore it is a grave error to speak here of 'contemplation.' Dr. Colquhoun has done in the essays we mentioned, previously, memory which is conditioned by time in the objective sense of the word, is a double spatial to corporeal substance alone, and does not extend beyond the limits of this particular and restricted medium of human consciousness. It is therefore mentioned among these physical elements in *HAṬHATA-SHĀSTRĀ*, which has descended to a dual correspondence of bodily state.

THE CORONAL ARTERY

physical regeneration which has made of him a man 'voice born,' *divya*)² with the spiritual Grace (*Pranada*) of Brahman, which resides in this vital centre (relatively to the human individual concerned), escapes from itself of every link with the bodily condition which may still exist and enters a solar ray (that is to say, symbolically, an emanation from the spiritual Sun, which is Brahman itself, this time considered universally: the solar ray is nothing else than a particularisation, relatively to the being in question, or, if it be preferred, a 'polarisation' of the supra-individual principle *Indra* or *Atish*, by which the multiple manifested states of the being are linked to one another and placed in communication with *divya*, the transcendent Personality, which is identical with the spiritual Sun itself); it is along this route, (described as the path of the 'solar ray') that it travels by night or by day, in winter or in summer.³ The contact of a ray of the (spiritual) Sun with the awakened is constant, so long as the body lasts (as a living organism and vehicle of the manifested being)⁴: the ray of the (intelligible)

“The interpretation of a ‘second birth,’ as we have already pointed out, therefore, in view of those which are common to all theological systems, in Christianity, in particular, possible interpretation is very clearly represented by Scripture. E. g. The passage from the Gospel: “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.” Verily, verily, I say unto thee except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.” “Verily and thou I said unto thee, ye must be born again. The John is, I in 3. Water is looked upon by many traditions as the original medium of being, by reason of its symbolism, as an original medium on, according to which it stands for Christ. Christ as a higher word, by transposition, water is Universal Possibility, and, therefore, is born of Spirit. Because I, one of the Virgin” and therefore an adopted brother of Christ and His mother of the “Kingdom of God.” On the other hand of our system that the “spirit” in the text just quoted is the Father. Christ, who associated with water as a complementary principle, is in the opening passage of Genesis and it is in accordance therewith that Christ, who stands for, we have the idea of justification by the elements, such as to be the first with all mankind as well as religious idea, and moreover, contains itself as always looked upon as a second birth, especially as long as it is in accordance, by comparison with original creation, but of course not in accordance, by genuine manner as we are here qualified to receive it.

* The *light* inside any other consideration, should be subjected to the test that there is no question here of a ray of the fact in the physical sense (for as this same counterfactual content would obviously be impossible) and that the relevance can only be in the fact of a counterfactual sense. The ray which is connected with the causal action in this causal sequence.

THE CORONAL ARTERY

Light, emitted from the Sun, reach this (subtle) artery; and, reciprocally (in reflected mode), extend from the artery to the Sun (in an indefinite prolongation by means of which communication, either virtual or effective, is established between the individuality and the Universal).¹

Everything that has just been said is completely independent of temporal circumstances and of all other similar contingencies which accompany death; that is not to say, however, that these circumstances are always devoid of any influence upon the posthumous condition of the being, but they have only to be considered in certain cases, which moreover we can but indicate here without further development. "The preference for summer, as an example of which the case of Bishara is cited, who waited for the return of the favourable season for his death, does not concern the Sage who, in the contemplation of Brahma, has accomplished the rite (relative to 'incantations'?) as prescribed by the *Veda*, and who has consequently acquired (at least virtually) the perfection of Divine Knowledge², but it concerns those who have followed the observances taught by the *Sâdhya* or the *Yoga-Sâdhya*, in accordance with which the time of day and the season of the year are not matters of indifference, but have (for the liberation of the being leaving the bodily state after a preparation carried out in conformity with the methods referred to) an effective action as elements inherent in the rite (in which they

¹ *Chandogya Upanishad*, Prapancha S. Nikanda, v. 1, 10, 1.

² The word "incantation" of most Sanskrit texts, and its rendering essentially in an equation of the being towards the Universal with the object of obtaining an agreed destination whatever may be the material means, such as gestures (mudras), words or musical sounds (mantras), or other signs (sacred and so on, that can be employed in various supports of the sacred act, and which have in their effect the production of Brahmic vibrations causing a vibration throughout the individual coils of matter of the being. Such "incantation" has nothing whatever to do with the magical practices for which the same name is sometimes applied in the West, and with a religious act such as prayer; all the methods in question are related exclusively to the realm of metaphysical realization.

³ We are naturally, because of this perfection, more effective. "Innocence" would be that way that already have been obtained. Knowledge is in its theoretical perfect, even though the corresponding realization has as yet only been partially accomplished.

THE CORONAL ARTERY

interest in conditions upon which the effects to be obtained depend).¹⁷ It goes without saying that, in the latter case, the restriction referred to only applies to beings which have stopped short at the attainment of degrees of realization corresponding to extensions of the human individuality; for one who has effectively transcended the limits of individuality, the nature of the means employed at the starting point of realization could have no influence of any kind on his subsequent conduct.

¹⁷ *Ashtavakra*, *Taittiriya* 15, *Chandogya* 17 to 21.

CHAPTER XXI

THE "DEVINE JOURNEY" OF THE BEING - ON THE PATH OF LIBERATION.

THE remainder of the symbolical journey, to be carried out during the process of gradual liberation, starting from the end of the causal artery (sahasrāṇḍa) and proceeding, in constant communication with a ray of the spiritual Sun, up to the final destination of the being, is effected by following the way marked by the path of the ray and retracing it (according to its collected directions) back to its source, which is identical with that very destination itself. When we remember, however, that a description of this sort can apply to the posthumous states to be passed through successively both by those beings who obtain "Deliverance" on leaving the human state and also by those who, after the reabsorption of the human individuality, will be required on the contrary to pass into other states of individual manifestation, it will be evident that there must be two different itineraries corresponding to these two different cases; it is said, in fact, that the former follow the "Path of the Gods" (*deva-yāna*), whilst the latter follow the "Path of the ascetics" (*para-yāna*). These two symbolical itineraries are summarised in the following passage from the *Śārngayana-Upaniṣad*. "At what time those who tend towards Union (without having effectively realised it) quit manifested existence, either never to return or destined to return to it, I will reach thee, O Brahman. First, light, day-time, waxing moon, the half year when the sun ascends towards the north, it is under these luminous signs that those go to Brahman who know Brahman. Smoke, night, waning moon, the half year when the sun descends towards the south, it is under these shadowy signs that those pass to the

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

Sphere of the Moon (literally "attain the lunar light") those who later will return (to fresh states of manifestation). These are the two permanent Paths of the manifested world (*yogar*), the one bright, the other dim; by the one they go to return no more (from the unmanifested to the manifested); by the other they go to return again (into manifestation).¹

The same symbolism is expounded in greater detail in various passages of the *Patha*. To deal first with the *para-yoga*, we will confine ourselves to remarking that it does not lead beyond the Sphere of the Moon; it follows that on that path the being is not set free from form, that is to say from the individual condition understood in its most general sense, since, as we have already remarked, it is precisely form which defines individuality as such.² According to certain parallels which we have pointed out before, this Sphere of the Moon represents the "cosmic memory";³ it is on this account that it is the appointed abode of the *Pitrs*, that is to say of the beings belonging to the preceding cycle, who are regarded as the generators of the actual cycle, owing to that causal sequence at which the succession of cycles is but the symbol; this is the origin of the term *para-yoga*, while *deva-yoga* naturally indicates the Path leading to the higher states of the being, towards assimilation therefore with the very essence of the intelligible Light. It is in the Sphere of the Moon that forms which have completed the full course of their development are disengaged; and it is there also that are preserved the germs of forms as yet undeveloped, since in the case of forms as of everything else, the starting point and the finishing point are necessarily to be found in the same order of existence. For a further development of this subject it

¹ *Madhusudhano* 4.32. VIII, 12 to 16.

² On the *para-yoga*, see *Yogachakra* (Gangotri, Paritishkha, V. Kinnaraya, 1906), 1 to 7. *Arjuna* (*Arjuna*-*Upanishad*, *Arjuna* VI, *Arjuna* 1-10).

³ It is for this reason that it is mentioned with symbolism, even in the *Yoga*, that everything that has been lost on the earth is recovered there (*Yp. Yogas*, *Yogachakra*).

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

would be necessary to deal explicitly with the theory of cycles; here however it is sufficient to recall that each cycle being in reality a state of existence, the old form left off by a being not yet set free from individuality and the new form which it puts on necessarily belong to two different states (the passage from the one to the other taking place in the Sphere of the Moon, where the point common to both cycles is situated), since no being of any kind can pass through the same state twice, as we have explained elsewhere when pointing out the inaptitude of the "reincarnationist" theories invented by certain modern Westerners.¹

We shall dwell at rather greater length upon the *demagôge* which is concerned with the effective identification of the centre of the individuality,² where all the faculties have previously been reabsorbed into the "living soul" (*jeune âme*), with the very centre of the astral being, dwelling place of the Unearthed Being. We must again point out that the process in question only applies therefore in the case where that identification has not been realized during earthly life nor at the moment of death: once it has been achieved there is in fact no longer any "living soul" distinct from the Self, since the being is from that moment quit of the individual condition; that distinction, which never existed save in illusory mode (the illusion being inherent in the condition itself), ceases for the being from the moment it attains absolute reality; the individuality disappears together with all limiting and contingent determinations,

¹ All that we have just said can also be related to the evolution of *Jaoon*, the Lunar Sphere determining the evolution of the higher (as compared to states from the lower (individual) states, hence the double part played by the Moon in *Jaoon* both by the Motion of the "Sphere of the I" (the *Image*) and *Jaoon* Sphere, a distinction corresponding to that between the *demagôge* and the *gênagôge*. *Jaoon* as *Arctos* is now when it is the female form of *Jaoon*, and furthermore, note in passing that the "one" symbol next to "to go" (Latin *ire*), which certain writers, before in particular, this country to denote the root of the name *Jaoon* itself.

² It must be clearly borne in mind that this reference is to the original individuality, and not to individuality reduced to its compound materiality alone: moreover the latter no longer exists for the being in question - since it is the posthumous state that the entire construction here.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

and the Personality alone remains in its fulness, containing all its possibilities in their permanent, unmanifested state originally within itself.

According to the Vedic symbolism, as found in various texts of the *Upanishads*,¹ the being which follows the *deva-gāna*, after having left the Earth (*Bhū*, that is to say the corporeal world or the sphere of gross manifestation), is first conducted to the light (*svadit*), by which is meant here the Realm of Fire (*Tryan*), the Ruler of which is *Agni*, also called *Parashaktare* in a special signification of that name. It must be carefully noticed, moreover, that when we meet with the names of elements in the enumeration of these successive stages, this can only be in a symbolical sense, since all the *Āditi*s properly belong to the corporeal world, which is here represented in its entirety by the Earth (which, as element, is *Prithivī*); in reality then, the reference is to different modalities of the subtle state. From the Realm of Fire the being is led to the different kingdoms of the rulers (*dravṇi*, *drishī*) or distributors of the day, of the bright half of the lunation (waxing period or first half of the lunar month),² of the six months when the sun is climbing northwards and finally of the year, all of which is to be taken as referring to the correspondences of these divisions of time (the "moments" of which the *Shukra-sūtra* speaks) analogically transported into the extra-corporeal prolongations of the human state, and not as referring to these divisions themselves, which are literally applicable to the corporeal state only.³ Thence it

¹ *Chelodactylus* (new genus) *propinquus* Tl. *Chondra* 19, *chondra* 2 and 4, *the* *propinquus* V. *Chondra* 19, *chondra* 1 and 2. *Propinquus* (*Chelodactylus*) *propinquus* V. *Chondra* 19, *chondra* 1 and 2. *Propinquus* (*Chelodactylus*) *propinquus* V. *Chondra* 19, *chondra* 1 and 2. *Propinquus* (*Chelodactylus*) *propinquus* V. *Chondra* 19, *chondra* 1 and 2.

1. The western part of the mouth is called *parag-phinda* "the left part," and the eastern part is called *shwag-phinda* "the right part" of the mouth. Thus, respectively, *parag-phinda* and *shwag-phinda* are also used to denote the halves of a female's forehead consisting of an ornament that she wears only on special days and for an occasion.

² It is still far interesting to indicate the coexistence of the symbolical dimension with another dimension given by other traditional definitions. For example the idea of the Soul of the Ancient Egyptians and the Aztec Indians of the Mexicopolis (Quauhtli). The first would take us to the idea, in the Hindu tradition, of *Atman*, representing Knowledge, as it

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

passes to the Realm of Air (*Vāyu*), the Ruler of which (called by the same name) directs it towards the Sphere of the Sun (*Sūrya* or *Aditya*), and emerges from the upper level of his kingdom through a passage likened to the nave of a chariot wheel, that is to say to a fixed axis around which the rotation or mutation of all contingent things takes place (it should not be forgotten that *Vāyu* is essentially the "moving" principle), a mutation from which the being will henceforth escape.¹ It passes next into the Sphere of the Moon (*Chandra* or *Soma*), where however it does not remain like those following the *pitṛ-yāna*, but whence it mounts to the region of the lightning (*udha/V-* above which is the Realm of Water (*Ap*), the Ruler of which is *Varuna*² (as, analogically, the lightning flashes beneath the rain-clouds). The reference here is to the higher or celestial Waters, representing the totality of formless possibilities,³ as opposed to the lower Waters, which represent the totality of formal possibilities, there

the same time known as the "Land of Death" in its symbolism, as its relationship with the temporal domain we have just left. Following, would just rise to developments of the greatest interest and also to their illustrative comparison with some ancient Western traditions, all these questions, which can lead to great issues, are perhaps for now left open in another volume.

¹ To use the language of the Greek philosophers, we might say that it is all have escaped from "generation" (*γένεσις*) and "corruption" (*φθορά*) levels that are synonymous with "birth" and "death", when these words are made to apply to all the states of metaphysical manifestation – and from what has been said concerning the Lesser Spirit and its regeneration, we can also understand what these philosophers, and Aristotle in particular, meant when they thought that the universe itself, taken in subject as "generation" and "corruption", this universal world, in fact, still represents the "cause of form" of the five Elements known to us for this lifetime, representing the human cycle, they are represented as *corruptible*, that is to say there is no longer any foundation or demonstration possible for the being which has attained to these states.

² This word evokes the notion, from the east and farthest of the source, that between light and night – in its form of a very deep to white – the flash of lightning illumines the darkness. The latter is the symbol of ignorance (*avidyā*) while knowledge is an *avidyā* "illumination".

³ It may be noted, in passing, that this water is plainly the water in the Greek *Thalassa*, although some philosophers, but far very strange heretics, have just doubt on this identity. *Thalassa*, called *Okeanos* is indeed exactly the same thing as the "Ethereal Waters" spoken of in Chinese texts in we meet with again here in the Hindu symbolism.

⁴ The *Ap* itself is the celestial element, which also symbolizes these three key possibilities. They correspond to the three of the *śikha* position – and the *parjanya* (*rain*) is the proper equivalent of the *śikha* – as we

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

can be no further concern with the latter when once the being has transcended the Sphere of the Moon, since, as we remarked above, that is the cosmic region where the genesis of the whole of formal manifestation are elaborated. Lastly, the remainder of the journey is carried out through the intermediate luminous region (*Aetherial*, which has been interpreted already, though with a somewhat different application, in the description of the seven members of *Psakrothau*), which is the Realm of Light occupied by Ether (*Aléthe*, here representing the primordial state of undifferentiated equilibrium), up to the spiritual Centre where *Protygon*, "Lord of produced beings," resides, who, as has already been pointed out, is the principal manifestation and direct expression of *Arctura* itself in relation to the whole cycle or degree of existence to which the human state belongs. It is still necessary to take this state into account, although in principle only, since it is the one from which the being set forth, for even though it has been set free from form and individuality, it still retains certain ties with that state so long as it has not attained the absolutely unconditioned state, that is to say, so long as "Deliverance" is not fully actualized for it.

In the various texts where the "divine journey" is described, certain variations are to be met with affecting the number and the order of enumeration of the intermediate stations, but they are of slight importance and more apparent than real; the foregoing exposition however is the result of a general comparison of these texts and can

¹ In that context we said that it is the medium in which forms are elaborated, because in the scheme of the "three worlds" this region corresponds to the Realm of which manifestation, stretching from Earth to the Moon, has, in the extreme, the intermediate light in question is situated beyond the Lunar Sphere, therefore in the Aetherial, and it is identified with *Arctura* if one now understands by that word not the Planets or higher stars as a whole, but only their less spiritual portion. It will again be noticed, in this chapter too, how a knowledge of certain transcendental correspondences makes it possible to deeply and just the state symbolized in different ways.

² *Arctura*, whose name means "powerful," is also known in the Hymn of Hermes (I. 117) to be replaced by the identification indicated in the foregoing text. This *Arctura* is a higher state, but not a final one, and although complete it will be surpassed.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

that be regarded as a faithful expression of the traditional doctrine upon this question.¹ Besides, it is not our intention to embark upon a more detailed explanation of all this symbolism which will be, on the whole, clear enough as it stands to anyone who has some little familiarity with Oriental conceptions (we might even say with traditional conceptions in general) and their usual modes of expression; moreover its interpretation will be facilitated by all the illustrations we have already given, among which a considerable number of those analogical transpositions will have been met with, such as form the basis of all symbolism.² There is one point however which must be emphasized once again, even at the risk of repetition, because it is absolutely essential for the understanding of these matters. It must be clearly understood that when mention is made, for example, of the Spheres of the Sun and of the Moon, it is never the sun and the moon as visible stars, belonging purely to the corporeal realm, that are referred to, but rather the universal principles which these stars represent after their own fashion in the sensible world, including in certain cases the transmutations of those principles in different orders, in virtue of the analogical correspondences which interconnect all the states of the being.³ Indeed the different Worlds (*Lohas*),

¹ For this description of the various phases of the divine idea, see *Western Secret, Mystery II*, *Part. 2*, *Chapter 1* to 4.

² We will take this opportunity to apologize for having to multiply the borrowings and for having allowed them to multiply more upon them in order to dealing with interpretations of the text here referred to, and also when establishing correspondences with other doctrines, this method of borrowing in order to avoid breaking the thread of our exposition by too many digressions.

³ Natural phenomena in general, and especially instances of physical laws, are turned inward upon by the traditional doctrine wherever it is not simply means of expression, whereby they symbolize certain states of a higher order, and if they do so not symbolize such states, it is because they have no fundamentally anything but the expression of those very states in a particular cosmos, a sort of translation of the corresponding principle partially adapted to the special conditions of the corporeal and finite state. It can therefore be seen how great is the effect of those who recognize they have discovered "nature" in these doctrines, or who believe that the doctrines in question are only intended to describe and explain phenomena just as a "profane" science might do, though in a different form. There really is, however, the true relationship, by taking the spiritual level to which it represents, the sign for the thing of the idea signified.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

planets, Spheres and elementary Bodies which are symbolically described as so many regions (only symbolically however, since the being who journeys through them is no longer subject to space), are in reality but different states.¹ The spatial symbolism (like the temporal symbolism which so often serves to express the theory of cycles) is natural enough and is sufficiently general so as to be unlikely to confuse any save those who are incapable of understanding anything but the most grossly literal meaning; such people will never realize the workings of a symbol, because their conceptions are irremediably limited to existence on this earth and to the corporeal world, within which, by the most naive of illusions, they wish to compress the whole of reality.

The effective possession of these states can be obtained through identification with the principles which are described as their respective Rulers, and this identification operates in every case through knowledge, on condition that such knowledge is not merely theoretical; theory should only be looked upon as a preparation, which is however indispensable, for the corresponding realization. But, as regards each of these principles taken in itself and separately, the results of that identification do not extend beyond its particular domain, so that the obtaining of such states, which are still conditioned states, only constitutes a preliminary stage, a kind of approach (in the sense that we have already explained and with the restrictions which should be applied to such a manner of speaking) towards the "Supreme Identity," the ultimate goal attainable by the being in its complete and total universalization; moreover the realization of this Identity, for those who have first of all to pass by the

¹ The Sanskrit word *loka* is identical with the Latin *locus*. "place" : it is worth noting that in the Catholic doctrine, Heaven, Purgatory and Hell are likewise called *loca* : "places" being in that case also taken symbolically to represent states, but there is never any question of these positions either being situated in space, even in the most violent concretization of this doctrine : such a concretization could only have arisen in the "popularization" of ideas that have made their appearance in the eastern World.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

divine plan, may be deferred until the *prayer*, as already stated, the transition from each stage to the next only becoming possible for the being who has obtained the corresponding degree of effective knowledge.¹

Thus, in the case we met at present discussing, which is that of *Armanûsh*, the being can remove us, the cosmic order until the *prayer* without having attained effective possession of the transcendent state in which true metaphysical realization properly consists, but therefore, and from the very fact that he has passed beyond the Sphere of the Moon (that is to say emerged from the "current of forms"), he will none the less have obtained that "virtual immortality," which we defined previously. It is for this reason that the spiritual Centre referred to above is still only the centre of a particular state or of a certain degree of existence, that to which the being, as a human being, belonged and to which it continues to belong in a certain manner, because its total universalization in supra-individual mode is not actually accomplished, and this is also the reason for saying that in such a condition the bonds of individuality are not yet completely shattered. It is at this point precisely that conceptions which may properly be called religious stop short: as these conceptions always refer to emanations of the human individuality, the states to which they give access must necessarily preserve some connection with the manifested world, even when they reach beyond it; they are therefore not the same as those transcendent states to which there is no other means of access except pure metaphysical knowledge. This remark is especially applicable to the "mystical states"; and, as regards the posthumous states, there is precisely the same difference between "immortality" or "salvation," understood in the religious sense (the only sense normally taken into account in the West), and

¹It is important to observe here that it is, in the *prayer*, the realization of the "Supreme Identity" that the *Armanûsh* have obtained, and that they obtain exclusively, whereas the *Armanûsh* have not previously passed the stage of the *prayer* corresponding to the various stages of the *divine plan* as well as of the *philosophy*.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

"Deliverance," as there is between mystical realization and metaphysical realization accomplished during earthly life. In the strictest sense, therefore, one can here only speak of "virtual immortality" and, as its final term, "reintegration in passive mode." Actually this last expression lies outside the religious viewpoint, as commonly understood, and yet it is through it alone that the relative sense in which religion uses the word "immortality" is justified and that a kind of link or transition can be established between it and the absolute and metaphysical sense in which the same term is understood by Orientalists. All this moreover does not prevent us from admitting that religious conceptions are capable of a transposition by means of which they receive a higher and deeper meaning, for the reason that this meaning is also present in the sacred Scriptures upon which they are based; but by such a transposition they lose their specifically religious character, because this character is bound up with certain limitations, outside of which one has entered the purely metaphysical order. On the other hand a traditional doctrine such as the Hindu doctrine, which does not place itself at the point of view of the Western religions, does none the less recognise the existence of the states which are more particularly envisaged by those religions, and it must needs be so seeing that these states effectively constitute possibilities of the being; but such a doctrine cannot attribute to them an importance equal to that assigned to them by those doctrines which go so far (the perspective, if one may so put it, altering with the point of view) for going as it does beyond them, it is able to situate them in their exact place in the total hierarchy.

Thus, when it is said that the final goal of the "divine journey" is the World of Brahme (*Brahme-Loka*), it is not the Supreme Brahme which is intended, not involuntarily at all events, but only its determination as Brahmi, who is Brahme "qualified" (*saguna*) and, as such, considered as the "effect of the productive" Will (*Shakti*) of the

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

Supreme Principle" (*Kārya-Brahma*).¹ When *Brahma* is mentioned in this case he must be regarded in the first place as identical with *Hiranyagarbha*, principle of subtle manifestation and thus of the whole domain of human existence in its integrity, and we have as fact previously remarked that the being which has attained "virtual immortality" finds itself as to speak "incorporated" by assimilation into *Hiranyagarbha*; and this state, in which it may remain until the end of the cycle (*Brahma* existing as *Hiranyagarbha* for that cycle only), is what is most usually meant by the *Brahma-Loka*.² However, just as the centre of each state of a being contains the possibility of identification with the centre of the total being, to the cosmic centre where *Hiranyagarbha* dwells is identified virtually with the centre of all the worlds:³ that is to say that for the being who has passed beyond a certain degree of knowledge *Hiranyagarbha* appears as identical with a higher aspect of the "Non-Supreme"⁴ which is *Ishtvara* or Universal Being, first principle of the whole of manifestation. At this stage the being is no longer in the subtle state, not even in

¹ The word *kārya*, "effect," is derived from the verbal root *kr* "to make" with the addition of the suffix *ya* to make an accomplishment as in the *śāp* ya.

² That which is to be made (or to be well manifested). That which is given to be made, "does yet" is a modification of the root, 15. 10. 1. This term therefore implies a certain notion of "becoming," which necessarily presupposes that whatever it applies to is only to be considered in relation to manifestation. Considering the root *kr* we will point out that it is identical with that of the Latin *creare*, which proves that the latter word, in its original sense, simply means "making." The idea of creation is much beyond metaphysical and Jewish ideas, and only attached word to the world when the Latin language came to be employed for the expression of Jewish Christian conceptions.

³ It is this which is the sacred space about the "Hirany" or "The silver" of the Vedic religion; for which, in this case, we may also include *Ishtara* when a number of *Hiranyas* are considered, which are then represented by planetary correspondences. They should be understood as denoting all the stages referred to the *Ishtara* Sphere (which is itself sometimes looked on as the "Hill of *Ishtara*," under the aspect of *Ishtara* *Śakti*, esp. 15 and including the *Brahma-Loka*).

⁴ Here again we are applying the fundamental analogy between the "efficiency" and the "existence."

⁵ The identification of one aspect with another higher aspect and so on through different degrees up to the Supreme Principle, is after all, just the "realizing" of so many "dependent" *Ishtaras*, which various "manifestations represent" as a series of acts that drop away in succession.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

the purely principled sense, but is in the unmanifested; it retains a certain connection however with the order of universal manifestation, of which *Isidore* is properly the principle, but it is no longer attached by any special links to the human state and to the particular cycle of which that state forms a part. This stage corresponds to the condition of *Prepa*, and it is the being who does not proceed beyond this condition who is described as united with *Isidore*, even at the time of the *prepa*, in the manner of deep sleep only; the return thence to another cycle of manifestation is still possible, but, since the being is not free from individuality (is distinct from what occurs to one following the *paripha*), that cycle can only be a formless and super-individual stage.¹ Finally, in the case where "Deliverance" is about to be obtained directly from the human state, still more is implied over and above what has just been described and in such a case the true goal is no longer Universal Being but the Supreme *Isidore* itself, that is to say "unqualified" (absolute) *Isidore* in its total infinitude, comprising both Being (or the possibilities of manifestation) and Non-Being (or the possibilities of non-manifestation), principle of the one and of the other, beyond them both therefore,² while also at the same time containing them both, in accordance with the teaching that we have already expounded on the subject of the unconditioned state of *Awat*, which is precisely what is

¹ By the *Awat*, it is said that such a being has passed from the condition of a man to that of a *Deva* (or what might be termed an "angelic" state in Western language). — On the contrary, at the end of the *paripha* there is a return to the "world of men" (human-kind), that of us, say, to an individual condition, as described by analogy with the human state, although it must not be made to differ, since the being can never return to a state through which it has already passed.

² We would however remind the reader that unqualified Nothing-like the Unmanifested, in so far as the being is not merely identified with the universal principle of manifestation, which is not Being, can be understood as a total state of unity, as is identified with the Supreme Principle. To say our ignorance, is contradictory between Non-Being and Being, or between the unqualified and the manifested (even if as the latter case has given us better than Being) can only be a purely apparent one, since metaphysically the discrepancy that exists between the two terms does not consist of any real opposition between them.

THE "DIVINE JOURNEY"

referred to in the present instance.³ It is in this sense that the shade of *Brother* (or of *Lord* in this unconditioned state) is even "beyond the spiritual Sun" (which is *Lord* in its third condition, identical with *Isidore*);⁴ just as it is beyond all the spheres of the particular states of existence, individual or supra-individual; but this shade cannot be directly attained by those who have only meditated upon *Brother* through the medium of a symbol (*prelude*), each meditation (*symbol*) only having in that case a definite and limited result.⁵

The "Supreme Identity," therefore, is the finality of the "liberated" being, that is, of the being who is freed from the conditions of individual human existence as well as from all other particular and limiting conditions (*qualities*), which are looked upon as so many bonds.⁶ When the

³ In this connection, with the object of calling further attention to the agreement of the different conditions, we will now again quote a passage from the *Trilogie*, or *Unly Givens*, *Abstrakt* or *Abstrakt* (the *Trilogie*). The common thought of the "Supreme Identity" is one, building it, but when used in order to the two worlds (theoretical and actual), it is the same and is only as such as the two worlds (theoretical and actual) are the same. Universal Being, but does not pass beyond it, it is the same and for it each thing is greater than the world, but for the individual world, for the world's "world" must have by themselves individual and not confined to its level (meaning) and the supra-world world, for the one meaning, applying the same transposition, both taken together.

⁴ On this point the *Trilogie*, who have failed to pass the real significance of the two through only taking it in its purely physical sense, have suggested some very strange interpretations. Thus M. Givens, who rather subtly "By its change and change, the one becomes the life of the world," the liberated man must beyond the world of the one. Does this not signify the importance that it is merely a matter of us being old age and reaching a certain immortality such as it might, by certain means, pass through each?

⁵ *Brother-Sun*, *Abstrakt*, 18, *Trilogie*, 1, *Trilogie*, 1, 18.

⁶ In these conditions words such as *brother* and *father*, the proper meaning of which is "brother" are applied to the world of these two terms is derived from the word *brother*, which therefore means, according to the very being, being based by such conditions. When in using *brother*, the word of *brother* is *brother*, because it is by the "brothering" of the two terms, the one is derived. The word *brother* is then given a special meaning to oppose an actual relation to a theoretical (theoretical) one, to which the value being necessary, derived by the theoretical, at last, variety of it. But we cannot deny of expressing here, even in dictionary fashion, a theory of *brother*, which, taken in that sense, is necessarily a given situated in scientific communication with higher states, and which is to be removed from *brother* state of "brothering" or "brothering" and others of a like nature, since which are only intelligible from the specifically religious point of view.

THE "CYBER JOURNEY"

man (or rather the being who was previously in the human state) is thus "delivered," the "Self" (*Atma*) is fully realized in its own "undivided" nature and is then, according to Anandakari, an omnipresent consciousness (having change as its attribute), the teaching of Jaimini is adopted, but he specifies in addition that this consciousness manifests the divine attributes (*ananyasya*) as transcendent faculties, from the fact that it is united to the Supreme Essence.¹ Such is the nature of complete Liberation, obtained through the fullness of Divine Knowledge; as for those whose contemplation (*dhyana*) has only been partial, although active (metaphysical realization remaining incomplete), or has been purely passive (as in the case of Western mystics), they enjoy certain higher states,² but without being able to arise forthwith to perfect Union (*Yoga*), which is one and the same thing as "Deliverance."

J. Polym. Sci. Part A: Polym. Chem.: Vol. 42, Issue 1, 1-10 (2004) © 2003 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

[illegible]

¹ In a. 1949, in the region, a transition of two tracks, and as such described as "apexes" or "quadrants" according to whether it concerns *Prunella* or *Alnus* (*Alnus* and *Prunella* in this case or to the other).

CHAPTER XXII

FINAL DELIVERANCE

"DELIVERANCE" (*Môkshâ* or *Mokshâ*), that is to say the final liberation of the being of which we have just spoken and which is the ultimate goal towards which the being tends, differs absolutely from all states which that being may have passed through in order to reach it, since it is the attainment of the supreme and unconditioned state, whereas all the other states, no matter how exalted, are still conditioned, that is to say subject to certain limitations which define them, making them to be what they are and characterizing them as determinate states. These remarks apply to the supra-individual states as well as to the individual states, in spite of the differences in their respective conditions, and even the degree of pure Being itself, although it is beyond all existence in the strict sense of the word, namely beyond all manifestation both formless and formal, still implies a determination, which, though primordial and principal, is none the less already a limitation. It is through Being that all things in every mode of universal Existence subsist, and Being subsists through Itself; It determines all the states of which it is the principle and is only determined by Itself; but to determine oneself is none the less to be determined and therefore limited in some respect, so that Infinity cannot be attributed to Being, which must under no circumstances be regarded as the Supreme Principle. It is here that one may observe the metaphysical incompleteness of the Western doctrine, even of those, it must be admitted, in which some degree of true metaphysics is nevertheless present: stopping short

¹ We are alluding only to the philosophical doctrine of necessity out of the Middle Ages, since the period of classical metaphysics was the very age-born of metaphysics: and this does not stand in the least in contrast with the pseudo-metaphysical character of those in which the negation is frankly

FINAL DELIVERANCE

at Being, they remain incomplete even theoretically (without referring to realization, which they leave out of account altogether), and, as usually happens in such cases, they exhibit an undesirable tendency to deny that which lies outside their sphere and which, from the viewpoint of pure metaphysics, is precisely the most important part of all.

The acquisition or, to speak more accurately, the taking possession of higher states, whatever their nature, is thus only a partial, secondary and contingent result, and although this result may appear immense by comparison with the individual human state (and above all by comparison with the corporeal state, the only one effectually possessed by ordinary people during their earthly existence) it is none the less true that, in itself, it amounts strictly to nothing in relation to the supreme state, since the finite, while becoming indefinite through the extensions of which it is capable, that is to say through the development of its own possibilities, always remains nothing in comparison with the infinite. Ultimately therefore a result of this kind is only of value by way of preparation for "Union," that is to say it is still only a means and not an end; to mistake it for the end is to continue in illusion, since all the states in question, up to and including Being, are themselves illusory in the sense we have attributed to that word from the beginning. Besides, in any state where some form of distinction remains, that is to say in all the degrees of Existence including those not belonging to the individual order, it is impossible for the universalization of the being to become effective, and even union with Universal Being, according to the mode in which it is accomplished in the condition of *Prâjñā* (or in the

imperfect). Naturally, our present remarks only apply to theories that are foreign to the "profane" world, and do not refer to the major traditions of the West, which, so long at least as they possessed a character that was genuinely and fully "religious," could not be limited in this way, but only in the course have been metaphysically completed under the limited heading of theory and realization. These traditions however have never been known in any but an abridged form outside of southern Asia or the Far East countries.

FINAL DELIVERANCE

posthumous state corresponding to that condition), is not "Union" in the full sense of the word, were it so, the return to a cycle of manifestation, even in the formless order, would no longer be possible. It is true that Being is beyond all distinction, since the first distinction is that of "essence" and "substance" or of *Parah* and *Pragya*, nevertheless *Brahma*, as *Itihasa* or Universal Being, is described as *avasthanta*, that is to say as "implying distinction," since It is the immediate determining principle of distinction; only the unconditioned state of *Ishta*, which is beyond Being, a *prapancha-apisthana*, "without any trace of the development of manifestation." Being is one, or rather it is metaphysical Unity itself; but Unity embraces multiplicity within itself, since it produces it by the mere extension of its possibilities; it is for this reason that even in Being itself a multiplicity of aspects may be conceived, which constitute so many attributes or qualifications of It, although these aspects are not effectually distinguished in It, except in so far as we conceive them as such: yet at the same time they must be in some way distinguishable for us to be able so to conceive them. It might be said that every aspect is distinguishable from the others in a certain respect, although none of them is really distinguishable from Being, and that all are Being itself; we therefore find here a kind of principal distinction, which is not a distinction in the sense in which the word applies in the sphere of manifestation, but which is its ontological transposition. In manifestation distinction implies separation; but that separation has nothing really positive about it, since it is only a mode of transition¹; pure Being, on the contrary, is beyond "separation." Thus, that which exists at the level of pure Being is "non-dis-

¹ This can be applied, in Christian thinking, to the conception of the Trinity: each Order Person is God, but so too the other Persons; in Substantive philosophy the same might also be said of the "transcendent order" each one of which is co-extensive with Being.

² In the individual state, separation is determined by the presence of form; in the non-individual state, it must be determined by some other condition, since these states are identical.

FINAL DELIVERANCE

unqualified," if distinction (*viśeṣa*) be taken in the sense applicable within the manifested states, and yet in another sense there is still present an element that is "dis-tinguished" (*viśeṣita*) in Being all things (meaning thereby their personalities) are "one" without being confused and distinct without being separated.¹ Beyond Being one cannot speak of distinction of any kind, even principal, although at the same time it cannot be said that there is confusion either; one is beyond multiplicity and beyond Unity as well; in the absolute transcendence of this supreme state none of those expressions can any longer be applied even by analogical transposition, and that is why recourse must be had to a term of negative form, namely to "non-duality" (*advaita*), as we have already explained; even the word Union is undoubtedly imperfect, because it evokes the idea of Unity, but we are obliged nevertheless to make use of it for the translation of the term *Yoga*, since the Western languages have no alternative to offer.

Deliverance, together with the faculties and powers which it implies so to speak "by superaddition" (because all states with all their possibilities are necessarily comprised in the absolute realization of the being), but which, we repeat, must only be considered as accessory and even "accidental" results and in no wise as constituting a final goal in themselves—Deliverance, we say, can be obtained by the *Yogi* (or rather by him who becomes such in virtue of obtaining it), with the help of the observances indicated in the *Yoga-Sūtra* of Patañjali. It can also be favoured by the practice of certain rites,² as well

¹ In this is to be found the final difference separating the path of *Yoga* of Haimanika, who maintains the principle distinct from that of Shankara—*advaita*—who transcends it.

² These rites are in every respect compatible to those claimed by the *Yogi* but under the present denomination of *śāstra*; they are mostly passed on by him, already mentioned, as the means of discipline and its consequent energy in all the various spheres. Such are also the often called *mantra* (word) and *dhyaṇa* (grip) in the otherwise partially heterodox doctrine of the *Padma-purāṇa*, under different forms of this it constitutes the core in Hindu *Yoga* of at least equivalent to it.

FINAL DELIVERANCE

as of various particular styles of meditation (*śikṣa-vaiśāḍī* or *deliverance-vaiśāḍī*); but it must be understood that all such means are only preparatory and have nothing essential about them, for "man can acquire true Divine Knowledge even without observing the rites prescribed (for each of the different human categories, in conformity with their respective natures, and especially for the different *āśramas* or regular stages of life)², and indeed many examples are to be met with in the *Pads* of persons who have neglected to carry out such rites (the function of which is compared in the *Pads* to that of a saddle-horse, which helps a man to reach his destination more easily and more rapidly, but without which he is able to reach it all the same), or who have been prevented from doing so, and yet, by maintaining their attention perpetually concentrated and fixed on the Supreme *Brahma* (in which consists the one and only really indispensable preparation), have acquired true Knowledge concerning It (Knowledge which, for that reason, is likewise called "supreme")."³

Deliverance, then, is only effective in so far as it essentially implies perfect Knowledge of *Brahma*; and, inversely, that Knowledge, to be perfect, presupposes of necessity the realisation of what we have already termed the "Supreme Identity." Thus, Deliverance and total and absolute Knowledge are truly but one and the same thing; if it be said that Knowledge is the means of Deliverance, it must be added that in this case means and end are inseparable, for Knowledge, unlike action, carries its own fruit within itself⁴, and moreover within this sphere a distinction such as that of means and end can amount to no more

² *Chāndogya Upanishad, Prapthihā, VIII*

³ Furthermore, the man who has reached a certain degree of realisation is called *śrotravivṛtting*, that is to say "perfectly awake (jagrat)" and, beyond the stage of earthly existence (*āśramas*) - none of the usual distinctions any longer apply to such a being from the moment that he has effectively transcended the limits of materiality, even though he has not yet arrived at the final goal.

⁴ *Bṛhadaranyaka, Adhyāya III, Pāda 4, verses 26 to 28*

⁵ *Brahma*, both action and its fruits are equally transient and "impermanent"; whereas, on the contrary, Knowledge is permanent and total, and the same applies to its fruit which is not distinct from Knowledge itself.

FINAL DELIVERANCE

than a mere figure of speech, unavoidable no doubt when one wishes to express these things, in so far as they are expressible, in human language. If therefore Deliverance is looked upon as a consequence of Knowledge, it must be specified that it is a strict and immediate consequence. This is most clearly affirmed by Shankarāchārya in the following terms: "There is no other means of obtaining complete and final Deliverance excepting Knowledge; it alone loosens the bonds of passion (and of all other consequences to which the individual being is subjected); without Knowledge, *Bhakti* (*Ānanda*) cannot be obtained. Action (*Karma*, whether understood in its general sense or as applied specially to the performance of rites), not being opposed to ignorance (*avidyā*),¹ cannot remove it; but Knowledge dispenses ignorance as light dispenses darkness. As soon as the ignorance born of earthly affections (and other analogous bonds) is banished (and every illusion with it), the "Self" (*Ātma*), by its own splendour, shines afar (through every degree of existence) in an undivided state (penetrating all and illuminating the totality of the being), as the sun spreads its brightness abroad when the clouds have scattered."²

A most important point to note is the following. action, no matter of what sort, cannot under any circumstances liberate from action; in other words it can only bear fruit within its own domain, which is that of human individuality. Thus it is not through action that it is possible to transcend individuality, taking individuality here moreover in its integral extension, for we do not for a moment pretend that the consequences of action are limited to the corporeal modality only; our previous remarks on the subject of life, which is in fact inseparable from action, will be found applicable in this instance. Hence it follows immediately that "Salvation" is

¹ *Ignorance* would like to translate *avidyā* or *avidyā* as "misconception" rather than "ignorance"; we remind that we cannot clearly see the need for this change.

² *Ātma-Bhāṣa* (Knowledge of the Self).

FINAL DELIVERANCE

the religious sense given to the word by Western people, being the fruit of certain actions,¹ cannot be identified with "Deliverance", and it is all the more urgent to state this explicitly since orientals constantly confuse the two together.² "Salvation" is properly speaking the attainment of the *Brahma-Loka*, and we will further specify that by *Brahma-Loka* must here be understood exclusively the shade of *divyapargada*, since any more exalted aspect of the "Non-Supreme" has outside individual possibilities. This accords perfectly with the Western conception of "immortality" which is simply an indefinite prolongation of individual life, transposed into the subtle order and extending to the *prelaks*. All this, as we have already explained, represents but one stage in the process of *brahma-muktir*; moreover the possibility of a return into a state of manifestation (re-individual however) is not definitely excluded for the being who has not passed beyond this stage. To go further and so free oneself entirely from the coarseness of life and duration which are inherent in individuality, there is no other path but that of Knowledge, either "non-supreme" and leading to *śivānanda*,³ or "supreme" and conferring immediate Deliverance. In the latter case there is no longer even occasion to consider a passage at death through various higher, though still transitory and conditioned states. "The Self (*Ātma*, since there can be no further question of *śarīra*, all distinction and all 'separateness' having disappeared) of him who has attained the perfection of Divine Knowledge (*brahma-*

¹ The Sanskrit expression "to work out one's salvation" i. e. liberate perfectly accords.

² Thus of Christians, for example, who often identify by the word "salvation" both liberating, to and of his works, without ceasing to repeat, we will not say the real difference which has been explained here, but even the mere possibility of recurrence in this identification.

³ It is hardly necessary to point out that this too, even if it comprised a realization rendering it truly efficacious, instead of remaining simply theoretical as it is possible the case (under the "symbolical state" can be said to represent such a realization, which is only partially and on certain essential points, would always be included as an activity in the "non-supreme" Knowledge.

FINAL DELIVERANCE

Fisher) and who has consequently obtained final Deliverance, ascends, on quitting its bodily form (and without passing through any intermediate stages), to the Supreme (spiritual) Light which is *Brabon*, and identifies itself with It, in an undivided and conformable manner, just as pure water, mingling itself with the clear lake (without however losing itself in it in any way) conforms itself in every respect therewith."¹

¹ *Principles of Science*, Volume IV, Part 4, Chapter 1, p. 4.

CHAPTER XXIII

YOGIN-MURTI AND JIVAN-MURTI

DELIVERANCE, in the case which has just been discussed, is properly speaking liberation achieved when "out of the bodily form" (*nada-śarīra*) and obtained is an immediate manner at the moment of death, Knowledge being already virtually perfect before the termination of earthly existence; it must be distinguished therefore from deferred and gradual liberation (*brahma-mukti*), and it must also be distinguished from liberation obtained by the Yogi during his actual lifetime (*jīva-mukti*), by virtue of Knowledge no longer only virtual and theoretical but fully effective, that is to say by genuine realisation of the "Supreme Identity." It must indeed be clearly understood that the body cannot constitute an obstacle to Deliverance any more than any other type of contingency; nothing can enter into opposition with absolute totality, in the presence of which all particular things are as if they were not. In relation to the supreme goal there is perfect equivalence between all the states of existence, so that no distinction any longer holds good between the living and the dead man (taking these expressions in the earthly sense). In this we note a further essential difference between Deliverance and "Salvation": the latter, as the Western religions conceive it, cannot be effectually obtained, nor even be assured (that is to say obtained virtually), before death; that which is attained through action can also always be lost through action; moreover there may be incompatibility between certain modalities of one particular individual state, at least accidentally and under particular conditions,¹ whereas there can no longer be

¹ This contention is indisputable, for if there were an absolute or essential incompatibility, the totalisation of the being would thereby be rendered impossible, since no modality can remain unaltered in the final realisation. Besides, the most extreme interpretation of the "conservation of the dead" is enough to show that, even upon a theological viewpoint, there can be no contradiction necessary between "salvation" and "incorporation."

VIDEHA-MUKTI AND JIVAN-MUKTI

anything of the kind once we are dealing with super-individual states, and above all with the unconditional state. To view things otherwise is to attribute to one special mode of manifestation an importance which it could not possess and which even manifestations in its strongest sense claim; only the prodigious inadequacy of Western conceptions in regard to the constitution of the human being could render such an illusion possible, and only this could, moreover, give rise to any astonishment at the fact that Deliverance may be accomplished during life on earth as well as in any other state.

Deliverance or Union, which is one and the same thing, implies "by superaddition," as has already been said, the possession of every state, since it is the perfect realisation (*vidyā*) and totalization of the being; besides, it matters little whether these states are actually manifested or not, since it is only as permanent and inevitable possibilities that they have to be taken into account metaphysically. "Lord of many states by the single effect of his will," the *Yogi* occupies but one of them, leaving the others empty of life-giving breath (*prāṇa*), like so many unused instruments; he is able to assume more than one form in the same way that a single lamp is able to feed more than one wick."¹ "The *Yogi*," says Aniruddha, "is in immediate contact with the primordial principle of the Universe and in consequence (secondarily) with the whole of space, of time and of everything included therein," that is to say, with manifestation, and more particularly with the human state in all its modalities.²

¹ Commentary of Śrīharṣa-śiṣya on the *Viśva-kōśa*.

² The following, a Tamil text, expresses the same idea: "In this being which has reached the state where it is united to the universal principle and no longer is dependent on anything... it will be perfectly free. It is also so: I testify and... the supernatural being has no longer the individuality of its mind; the human mind has no longer any limits of its own; the *Yogi* has not even a name of his own. And he is one with the *At*." (Cf. *Śaṅkara*, chapter I.) (Father Wilson's translation, page 143.) The *Yogi* or *Jivan-mukta*, as he has liberated from both name and form personified, which are the elements that constitute and characterize individuality, no longer possesses the form of the *Viśva-kōśa* where the dissolving of name and form is expressly referred.

Moreover it would be a mistake to suppose that liberation acquired when the being is quit of the bodily form (*mukha-mukhi*) is more complete than liberation "during life" (*jivan-mukti*); if certain Westerners have made this mistake it is always as a result of the excessive importance they attach to the corporeal state, and, while has just been said above dispenses us from further remarks on this subject. The *Yogi* has nothing further to obtain subsequently, since he has actually realized "trans-formative" (that is to say a passing beyond form) within himself, if not outwardly, it matters little to him therefore that a certain formal appearance persists in the manifested world, since henceforth, for him, it cannot exist otherwise than in illusory mode. Strictly speaking it is only for others that the appearance persists thus without external change, and not for him, since they are now incapable of limiting or conditioning him; these appearances affect and concern him no more than does all the rest of universal manifestation. "The *Yogi*, having crossed the sea of passions,² is united with Tranquillity³ and possesses the Self (unconditioned *Atma*, with which he is identified) in its plenitude. Having renounced those pleasures which are born of perishable external objects (and which

² This is the region of the "Lower Waters" or *Samudra* *pralaya* (the waters are here again in denoting the consequent modifications which go to make up the "stream of being").

³ This is the "Great Peace" (the *Samadhi* of the *Upanishads* system doctrine, or the *Paraprastha* of the *Ramanuja* system). The word *Samadhi*, or *Samadhi*, denotes the "real presence" of the Universal, or the "Light of Glory" as, and by which, according to Christian doctrine, the "heavenly vision" is brought about (p. 100). The "glory of God" in this already quoted text of the *Upanishads* (p. 100, 101). Here is another *Upanishad* (and pointing to the same subject). "Peace is the end it is *anubhava* (state). It is not that Union that gives. One simply becomes established there. Formerly one looked towards it. Nowdays the removal of passions and impurities is required, which does not yield anything useful." (*Upanishads*, Chapter 1). French translation by Father Viguer, page 22. The word "conditioned here" is the "lower state" of the *Samadhi* (the *Samadhi* which is in the *Samadhi*), being ultimately unconditioned in that it can only be spoken of as a *pralaya* (the word "Samadhi" and "knowledge" refer to the different periods in the cycle of temporal humanity: the condition of the present era corresponding to the *Samadhi* (and the *Samadhi*), the great majority of men having attained to peace and being, which cannot find them beyond the limits of their individuality, still less to the Supreme and unconditioned state.

VIDEHA-MURTI AND JIVAN-MURTI

are themselves but external and accidental modifications of the being), and rejoicing in Bliss (*Ananda*, which is the sole pervasore and imperishable object, and which is not different from the "Self"), he is calm and serene like the torch beneath an extinguisher,¹ in the fulgore of his own presence (which is no longer distinguished from the Supreme *Brahma*). During his (apparent) residence in the body he is not affected by its properties any more than the firmament is affected by that which floats in its bosom (because, in reality, he contains all states within himself and is not contained by any one of them); knowing all things (and thereby being all things, not distinctively, but as absolute totality), he remains unmutable, unaffected by contingencies.²

Thus there is no spiritual degree superior to that of the *Yogi* and it is evident that there cannot be; considered in his concentration within himself, he is also called *Muni*, that is to say the "Solitary one,"³ not in the popular and literal sense of the word, but as one who, in the fulgore of his being, realises the state of "perfect Solitude," which does not allow any disjunction between outer and inner, nor any extra-principial diversity whatsoever to subsist in the Supreme Unity (or as we should say, to be strictly accurate, in "Non-Duality"). For him the illusion of "separateness" has finally ceased to exist,

¹ This simile is possible to understand the real meaning of the word *Videha*, which Orientalists have misinterpreted in so many ways, this term, which is by no means peculiar to Buddhism, as is commonly supposed, usually means "a condition of death or of disturbance," the state otherwise of a being which is no longer subject to any change or to any modification nor to any of the other accidents or modes of accidental existence. *Ananda* is the representative condition (state or position) while *Parivartana* is the disambiguated state: the term *Parivartana* "modification of change or of state." And *Parivartana* are also employed in the same sense. In the *Upanishads* equally denotes the corresponding terms are found, "extinction" and "fire" (both literally "extinction" of the sensation).

² *Shankaracharya's Advaita-Sutra*.

³ The root of the word *Muni* appears to be the same as that of the Greek word "muse." *Muni* was the one who connected it with the "five senses" which denote reflection and concentrated thought, but this is quite opposite from the meaning of epistemological derivation, as well as from that of the meaning *muni* (the monastic, derived from *muni*, the only property apply to released thought).

and with it every confusion engendered by the ignorance (*avidyā*) which produces and sustains that illusion,² for, "imagining first that he is the individual "living soul" (*jīvaśū*), man becomes afraid (through belief in the existence of some being other than himself), like one who mistakes a piece of rope for a serpent; but his fear is dispelled by the certitude that he is not in reality this "living soul," but *Ātma* itself (in its unconditioned universality)."³

Śaṅkarācārya names three attributes which correspond in a way to so many functions of the *Śaṅkṣī*, the possessor of Knowledge, who, if that Knowledge be fully effective, is none other than the *Tat*:⁴ these three attributes are, in ascending order, *śūnya*, *pīṇḍīya* and *maṇa*.⁵ The first of these words means literally a state comparable to that of a child (*bālā*): it is a stage of "non-expansion," if one may so call it, where all the powers of the being are concentrated as it were in one point, realising by their unification an undifferentiated simplicity, comparable to embryonic potentiality.⁶ In a word which is somewhat different, but which completes the foregoing (since it implies both reabsorption and plenitude), it also

² To this extent, his ignorance belongs "false cognition" (*vidyā*), which consists in attributing to a being something which does not really belong to it.

³ Such an error is called *mañā*. It is properly speaking a manifestation which as we may perceive the essence of the being to which it is attributed, and which therefore only affects the person who then attributes it to them: sphere of an illusion.

⁴ *Śaṅkarācārya's*, *Śaṅkṣī*.

⁵ The state of *Śaṅkṣī* is properly speaking the last of the four states (the first three being the states of *Prāṇa*-water or "student of the sacred Science," *Manjā* of a Dove, of *Śrīkṣā* or "knowledge" and of *Paraprāṇa* or "wisdom"). But the name *Śaṅkṣī* is the expression extended, as in the present case, to the *Śūnya*, that is to say to the man who has attained perfect realisation (*śūnya*) and who is absorbed in it as we have explained before.

⁶ Commentary on the *Śaṅkṣī*-*Śūnya*, *Śaṅkṣī* 111, *Śūnya* 111, *Mañā* 111, *Mañā* 111.

⁷ Cf. these words from the *Śaṅkṣī*: "Śūnya 111, *Mañā* 111, *Mañā* 111, *Mañā* 111, for all such is the Kingdom of Heaven. . . . Whenever they not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child that is too wise to enter" (*St. Matthew* 23, 24, *St. Luke* 20, 26 and 27).

⁸ This stage corresponds to the "coiled Dragon" of the *Far Eastern* symbolism. Another frequently used symbol is that of the infant which withdraws itself entirely into its shell.

VIDEHA-MUKTI AND JIVAN-MUKTI

means the return to the "primal state," of which all the traditions speak and which Taoism and Buddhism maintain stress more especially. This return is in fact a necessary stage on the path leading to Union, since it is only from this primal state that it is possible to escape the limits of human individuality in order to rise to the higher state.¹

A further stage is called *pāraśya*, that is to say "learning," an attribute indicating the teaching function: the possessor of Knowledge is qualified to communicate it to others or, more accurately speaking, to awaken corresponding possibilities within them, since Knowledge as such is strictly personal and incommunicable. The *Pāraśya* therefore partakes more especially of the character of Guru or "Spiritual Master"; but he may be in possession of the perfection of theoretical knowledge only, and for this reason it is necessary to take into account, as a still further and final stage, *mānasa* or the state of *Mānā*, as being the only condition in which Union can genuinely be realized. There is yet another expression, *Karmāra*, which also means "isolation," and which at the same time expresses the ideas of "perfection" and "solitude"; this term is often employed as an equivalent of *Mānā*: *ānanda* denotes the absolute and unconditioned state which is that of the "delivered" being (*mukta*).

We have described the three attributes mentioned above as representing so many stages preparatory to Union: but obviously the *Yogi* who has reached the supreme goal

¹ This is the "return state" of the Judeo-Christian tradition: it explains why Dante placed the terrestrial Paradise on the summit of the Mountain of Purgatory, that is to say at the exact point where the being quits the Earth, as the human state, in order to rise to the Eternal (situated at the "Kingdom of God") in the language of Gospel symbolism.

² This is the *Śūdra* of the Vedas, standing also against *Mānava* society, the *Śūdra* in the temples, like the Hindu *Parivrajaka*.

³ *Yogi* is in the "view" referred to in the Thiruvaiyār quoted a little way back: and the "real" is also in reality the absolute *ātman*. (The use of the expression "the real" is, total absence of all particularity, is the equivalent of "the Infinite," is general in the Vedānta, and appears in all Māhāyāna Buddhist doctrines. Full "realization" of the *Yogi* is therefore identical with the attainment of the ultimate goal of Liberation—*Tranquillity*.)

VIDYĀ-MUKTI AND JIVAN-MUKTI

possesses each one of them *a fortiori*, since he possesses all states in the fulness of his essence.¹ These three attributes are unified moreover in what is called *satvārjya*, namely participation in the essence of *Īśvara*, for they correspond respectively to the three *śaktis* of the *Trivara*; if it be understood that the fundamental characteristic of the "primordial state" is "Harmony," it will immediately be apparent that *śānti* corresponds to *Lakṣmī*, while *śāntiśya* corresponds to *Śarada* and *manas* to *Pūrṇā*.² This point is of particular importance for understanding the nature of the "powers" which pertain to the *jīva-mukta*, as secondary consequences of perfect metaphysical realization.

Furthermore the exact equivalent of the theory we have just mentioned is also to be found in the Far-Eastern tradition: this is the theory of the "four Happinesses," the first two being "Longevity," which, as has already been remarked, is simply perpetuity of individual existence, and "Prosperity," which consists in the indefinite prolongation of the individual through all his "modalities." These two Happinesses therefore only concern the extension of the individuality and they are included in the restoration of the "primordial state," which implies their complete attainment; the remaining two, which refer on the contrary

¹ It is also worth noting that these three attributes, taken in the same order, are in a sense respectively "permeated" by the directions *śānti*, *śāntiśya*, the fourth direction, that of the *Śarada*, for he understands here in the most exact sense, so to speak, realization and union by the other *Chakras*, just as the final state of the *Trivara* essence—*manas*—all the previous states that have previously been traversed as so many preliminary stages.

² *Lakṣmī* is the *Śakti* of *Paśura*. *Śarada* or *Śhīṭā* is that of *Śaśura*, *Pūrṇā* is that of *Śiva*. *Pūrṇā* is also called *Śrī*, that is to say "Ad," who is devoid of approach. It is interesting to observe that nothing corresponding to these three *Śaktis* is to be found even in the Western tradition. Thus, in Western symbolism the "three great pillars" of the Temple are "Wisdom, Strength and Beauty". Here *Śhīṭā* is *Śāntiśya*, *Śrī* is *Pūrṇā* and *Śarada* is *Lakṣmī*. *Śarada*, *Lakṣmī*, who took form the recipient of this sacred teaching (called *śāntiśya* in its earlier form) took a Hinduist name, denoting the three principles (denoted here as being "Wisdom, Power and Goodness," which comes to give the same thing, for "Beauty" and "Goodness" are inseparably but two aspects of a single idea, which is precisely the idea of "Harmony," as conceived by the Greeks and especially by Plato.

VIDYHA-MURTI AND JIVAN-MURTI

to the higher and extra-individual states of the being,¹ see the "Great Wisdom" and the "Perfect Science," that is to say *vidyā* and *māna*. Finally these "four Happinesses" attain their fulness in a "fifth," which contains them all principally and unites them synthetically in their single and indivisible essence: no name is ascribed to this "fifth Happiness" (any more than to the "fourth state" of the *Atitadāya Upanishad*), since it is impossible and cannot be the object of any distinctive knowledge: it is however easy to see that we are concerned here with nothing less than Union itself or the "Supreme Identity," obtained in and through complete and total realization of what other traditions call "Universal Man," for the *Yogi*, in the true sense of the word, like the "transcendent man" (*Manu-jna*) of Taoism, is also identical with "Universal Man."²

¹ This explains how it is that the two first "Happinesses" fall within the period of *Chikitsā*, whereas the two others pertain to the state of *Taoism*.

² This identity is perfectly affirmed in the modern western teaching concerning "the realization of the Prophet."

CHAPTER XXIV

THE SPIRITUAL STATE OF THE YOGI: THE SUPREME IDENTITY

To give as exact an idea as possible of the actual state of the *Yogi* who, through Knowledge, is "delivered in this life" (*jñāna-mukta*) and has realised the "Supreme Identity," we will once again quote Śaṅkarācārya¹: his remarks on the subject, describing the highest possibility to which the being can attain, may serve at the same time as a conclusion to the present study.

"The *Yogi*, whose intellect is perfect, contemplates all things as abiding in himself (in his own Self, without any distinction of outer and inner) and thus, by the eye of Knowledge (*Jñāna-dhāritā*, a term which can be rendered fairly exactly by 'intellectual intuition'), he perceives (or rather conceives, not rationally and discursively, but by a direct awareness and immediate 'seeing') that everything is *Ātma*.

"He knows that all contingent things (the forms and other modalities of manifestation) are not different from *Ātma* (in their principle), and that apart from *Ātma* there is nothing, 'things differing simply (in the words of the *Pratī*) in attribution, accident and name, just as earthen vessels receive different names, although they are but different forms of earth'; and thus he perceives (or conceives, in the same sense as above) that he himself is all things (since there can no longer be anything

¹ *Ātma-Brahma*. In grouping together a selection of passages from this chapter we shall not feel constrained to follow the order of the text too strictly. Besides, in general, the logical sequence of ideas cannot be exactly the same as a thought that end as a translation into a Western language, by means of the differences that exist between various "ways of thinking" upon which we have had some, in other occasions.

² See *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Brāhmin VI, Khanda 1, verses 4 to 8.

THE SPIRITUAL STATE OF THE YOGI

affecting his identity), pure, impossible, inexhaustible (in his essential eternality).

"He is (in the very words of the *Pada*) 'the Supreme Brahman, which is eternal, pure, free, single (in its absolute perfection), continually abounding in Bliss, without duality, (unconditioned) Principle of all existence, knowing (without that Knowledge implying any distinction of subject and object, which would be contrary to its "non-duality") and without end.'

"He is Brahman, after the possession of which there remains nothing to possess; after the enjoyment of whose Bliss there remains no felicity to be desired; and after the attainment of the Knowledge of which there remains no knowledge to be obtained.

"He is Brahman, which once beheld (by the eye of Knowledge), no object is contemplated, being identified with which, no modification (such as birth or death) is experienced; which being perceived (but not however as an object perceptible by any kind of faculty), there is nothing further to perceive (since all distinctive knowledge is therewith transcended and as it were annihilated).

"He is Brahman, which is disseminated everywhere and throughout all things (since there is nothing outside It and everything is necessarily contained in Its Infinity); in intermediate space, in that which is above and in that which is below (that is to say in the quality of the three worlds); the Real, abounding in Bliss, without duality, indivisible and eternal.

"He is Brahman, pronounced in the *Pada* to be absolutely distinct from that which It pervades (and which, on the contrary, is not distinct from It or at least only distinguishes itself from It in illusory mode)

¹ The reader may readily be reminded here of the Taoist text on the soul which we at greater length. "Do not inquire whether the Principle is in this or in that. It is in all things." (Chuang-tzu, chapter 31: *Farther Wanderer's translation*, para. 312).

² We would again call attention to the fact that the unpopularity of identifying between Brahman and the World involves the formal contradiction of "pantheism," as well as of "monismism" under all its forms.

THE SPIRITUAL STATE OF THE YOGI

continually abiding in Him and without duality.

"He is *Brahma*, by which (according to the *Pada*) are produced life (*jiva*), the inward sense (*manas*), the faculties of sensation and action (*indriya* and *karma*), and the elements (*gross* and *subtle*) which compose the manifested world (in the subtle as well as in the gross order)."

"He is *Brahma*, in which all things are united (beyond every distinction, even principal), upon which all actions depend (and which is itself *akarma*); that is why It is disseminated throughout all things (without division, dispersion or differentiation of any sort).

"He is *Brahma*, which is without size or dimensions (unconditioned), without extension (being indivisible and without part), without organ (being eternal), incorruptible, without shape, without (determined) qualities, without assignment or attribute of any kind.

"He is *Brahma*, by which all things are illuminated (participating in Its essence according to the degree of their reality), the Light of which causes the sun and all luminous bodies to shine, but which is not made manifest (itself by their light)."

"He himself pervades his own eternal essence (which is not different from the Supreme *Brahma*), and (simultaneously) he contemplates the whole World (manifested and unmanifested) as being (also) *Brahma*, just as fire intimately pervades a white-hot iron ball, and (at the same time) also reveals itself outwardly (by manifesting itself to the senses through its heat and its luminosity).

"*Brahma* resembles not the World," and apart from *Brahma* there is naught (for, if there were anything apart from It, It could not be *self*); everything that appears to exist apart from It cannot exist (in this manner) save in

* It is "That by which all is manifested, but which is itself manifested by nothing," according to a text that we have already quoted (*Upanishad, Khanda I, shloka 3 to 4*).

* The question of any sort of postulated conception is here reserved apart with such clear statements, it is difficult to account for certain errors of interpretation, which are so general in the West.

THE SPIRITUAL STATE OF THE YOGI

Illusory mode, like the apparition of water (mirage) in the desert (samsa).¹

"Of all that is seen, of all that is heard (and of all that is perceived or conceived by any faculty whatsoever) naught (veritably) exists apart from *Brahma*; and by Knowledge (principal and supreme), *Brahma* is contemplated as alone real, abounding in Bliss, without duality.

"The eye of Knowledge contemplates *Brahma* as it is in itself, abounding in Bliss, pervading all things; but the eye of ignorance discerns it not, discerns it not, even as a blind man perceives not the sensible light.

"The 'Self' being illumined by meditation (when a theoretical and therefore still indirect knowledge makes it appear as if it were receiving the light from a source other than itself, which is still an illusory distinction), and thus burning with the fire of Knowledge (realising its essential identity with the Supreme Light), is delivered from all accidents (or contingent modifications), and shines in its own splendour, like gold which is purified in the fire.²

"When the Sun of spiritual Knowledge rises in the bosom of the heart (that is to say at the centre of the being, called *Brahmapura*), it dispels the darkness (of ignorance veiling the single absolute reality), it pervades all, envelops all and illumines all.

"He who has made the pilgrimage of his own 'Self,' a pilgrimage not concerned with situation, place or time (or any particular circumstances or condition),³ which is

¹ This word *samsa*, derived from the root *smi*, "to see," applies to any false vision, notably halting or mistaking, and more especially to a false dream, the various aspects of which can be taken as a support of meditation in order to evade the idea of the principal misapprehension.

² We have seen before that gold is looked upon as being itself of a homogeneous nature.

³ Every distinction of place and time is illusory; the perception of all possible things (conceived synthetically in Universal Possibility, absolute and total) is effected without movement and without time" (J. and Jm. Hughes, vol. Fourth "Wager's translations," page 107).

THE SPIRITUAL STATE OF THE YOGI

everywhere' (and always, in the immutability of the 'eternal present'), in which neither heat nor cold are experienced (no more than any other sensible or even mental impression), which procures a lasting felicity and a final deliverance from all disturbance (or all modifications). Such an one is actionless, he knoweth all things (in *Arishuv*), and he attaineth Eternal Bliss."

¹ Similarly, in the Western occult traditions, it is said that the true practitioners meet "in the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which is every where." It must be clearly understood that the Rosicrucians in question have nothing in common with the numerous modern organizations which have adopted the name since 1880. It is said that shortly after the Thirty Years' War they fled Europe and withdrew into Asia.

INDEX OF ABBREVIATED TERMS

When transcribing Sanskrit texts we have not felt obliged to follow the complicated and more or less arbitrary method devised by the orientalists. The orthography we have adopted corresponds to the actual pronunciation as nearly as the Roman alphabet allows; since however the latter contains a relatively small number of letters, we have had to represent several distinct Sanskrit letters by means of the same Latin one. Furthermore, in the index below, we have been content to arrange the words, as transcribed, in the order of the Roman alphabet, which naturally is different from that of the Sanskrit alphabet, hoping thus to avoid some quite needless difficulties for those who are unacquainted with the latter.

[illegible]

1999

- [illegible]

1919, 20
 1920, 21, 22
 1921, 23
 1922, 24
 1923, 25
 1924, 26
 1925, 27
 1926, 28
 1927, 29
 1928, 30
 1929, 31
 1930, 32
 1931, 33
 1932, 34
 1933, 35
 1934, 36
 1935, 37
 1936, 38
 1937, 39
 1938, 40
 1939, 41
 1940, 42
 1941, 43
 1942, 44
 1943, 45
 1944, 46
 1945, 47
 1946, 48
 1947, 49
 1948, 50
 1949, 51
 1950, 52
 1951, 53
 1952, 54
 1953, 55
 1954, 56
 1955, 57
 1956, 58
 1957, 59
 1958, 60
 1959, 61
 1960, 62
 1961, 63
 1962, 64
 1963, 65
 1964, 66
 1965, 67
 1966, 68
 1967, 69
 1968, 70
 1969, 71
 1970, 72
 1971, 73
 1972, 74
 1973, 75
 1974, 76
 1975, 77
 1976, 78
 1977, 79
 1978, 80
 1979, 81
 1980, 82
 1981, 83
 1982, 84
 1983, 85
 1984, 86
 1985, 87
 1986, 88
 1987, 89
 1988, 90
 1989, 91
 1990, 92
 1991, 93
 1992, 94
 1993, 95
 1994, 96
 1995, 97
 1996, 98
 1997, 99
 1998, 100
 1999, 101
 2000, 102
 2001, 103
 2002, 104
 2003, 105
 2004, 106
 2005, 107
 2006, 108
 2007, 109
 2008, 110
 2009, 111
 2010, 112
 2011, 113
 2012, 114
 2013, 115
 2014, 116
 2015, 117
 2016, 118
 2017, 119
 2018, 120
 2019, 121
 2020, 122
 2021, 123
 2022, 124
 2023, 125
 2024, 126
 2025, 127
 2026, 128
 2027, 129
 2028, 130
 2029, 131
 2030, 132
 2031, 133
 2032, 134
 2033, 135
 2034, 136
 2035, 137
 2036, 138
 2037, 139
 2038, 140
 2039, 141
 2040, 142
 2041, 143
 2042, 144
 2043, 145
 2044, 146
 2045, 147
 2046, 148
 2047, 149
 2048, 150
 2049, 151
 2050, 152
 2051, 153
 2052, 154
 2053, 155
 2054, 156
 2055, 157
 2056, 158
 2057, 159
 2058, 160
 2059, 161
 2060, 162
 2061, 163
 2062, 164
 2063, 165
 2064, 166
 2065, 167
 2066, 168
 2067, 169
 2068, 170
 2069, 171
 2070, 172
 2071, 173
 2072, 174
 2073, 175
 2074, 176
 2075, 177
 2076, 178
 2077, 179
 2078, 180
 2079, 181
 2080, 182
 2081, 183
 2082, 184
 2083, 185
 2084, 186
 2085, 187
 2086, 188
 2087, 189
 2088, 190
 2089, 191
 2090, 192
 2091, 193
 2092, 194
 2093, 195
 2094, 196
 2095, 197
 2096, 198
 2097, 199
 2098, 200
 2099, 201
 2100, 202
 2101, 203
 2102, 204
 2103, 205
 2104, 206
 2105, 207
 2106, 208
 2107, 209
 2108, 210
 2109, 211
 2110, 212
 2111, 213
 2112, 214
 2113, 215
 2114, 216
 2115, 217
 2116, 218
 2117, 219
 2118, 220
 2119, 221
 2120, 222
 2121, 223
 2122, 224
 2123, 225
 2124, 226
 2125, 227
 2126, 228
 2127, 229
 2128, 230
 2129, 231
 2130, 232
 2131, 233
 2132, 234
 2133, 235
 2134, 236
 2135, 237
 2136, 238
 2137, 239
 2138, 240
 2139, 241
 2140, 242
 2141, 243
 2142, 244
 2143, 245
 2144, 246
 2145, 247
 2146, 248
 2147, 249
 2148, 250
 2149, 251
 2150, 252
 2151, 253
 2152, 254
 2153, 255
 2154, 256
 2155, 257
 2156, 258
 2157, 259
 2158, 260
 2159, 261
 2160, 262
 2161, 263
 2162, 264
 2163, 265
 2164, 266
 2165, 267
 2166, 268
 2167, 269
 2168, 270
 2169, 271
 2170, 272
 2171, 273
 2172, 274
 2173, 275
 2174, 276
 2175, 277
 2176, 278
 2177, 279
 2178, 280
 2179, 281
 2180, 282
 2181, 283
 2182, 284
 2183, 285
 2184, 286
 2185, 287
 2186, 288
 2187, 289
 2188, 290
 2189, 291
 2190, 292
 2191, 293
 2192, 294
 2193, 295
 2194, 296
 2195, 297
 2196, 298
 2197, 299
 2198, 300
 2199, 301
 2200, 302
 2201, 303
 2202, 304
 2203, 305
 2204, 306
 2205, 307
 2206, 308
 2207, 309
 2208, 310
 2209, 311
 2210, 312
 2211, 313
 2212, 314
 2213, 315
 2214, 316
 2215, 317
 2216, 31

rybníček, 39
 rybník, 39g, 173
 rybník, 39
 rybníček, 39

ry, 138
 rybník, 39g
 rybník, 39g

INDEX

rybník, 39g
 rybník, 39g
 rybník, 39g, 39g, 39g, 39g
 rybník, 39g, 39g, 39g
 rybník, 39g, 39g, 39g, 39g, 39g, 39g, 39g
 rybník, 39g
 rybník, 39g
 rybník, 39g
 rybník, 39g